

# The Congregational Review.

SEPTEMBER, 1887.

## MR. GLADSTONE AND HIS CRITICS.\*

WHEN the story of our own times comes to be told, it is tolerably certain that the impartial verdict of posterity will pronounce the present conspiracy against Mr. Gladstone one of the most disgraceful episodes in the history of this or indeed of any period. One of the closest parallels to it is found in the combination which drove Sir Robert Walpole from power. In both cases a great Minister fell a victim to the discontent of a section of his party—a discontent intensified by personal considerations on the part of some of its leaders. The marked difference between the two is that the great statesman of George II. had laid himself open to personal imputations of a very serious nature, whereas the far more illustrious statesman of the Victorian era is open to no charge except on the ground of his politics. To compare the two men is to insult Mr. Gladstone. Yet to-day the faults of Walpole are more than half condoned in consideration of his great qualities and in resentment of the bitter malignity with which he was pursued. Much more certainly will this be the case in relation to the illustrious Liberal leader, whose chief fault is that he is too great, too magnanimous, too far-seeing and enlightened for those with whom he is associated. His most devoted follower has no right to complain that the dissentient chiefs have withdrawn their confidence from their old chief, but there is just ground for the severest censure of the action which has turned a political difference into personal hostility.

\* *Mr. Gladstone. A Study.* By LOUIS J. JENNINGS, M.P. Second Edition. (W. Blackwood and Sons.) *Edinburgh Review*, July.

If we were asked to define the chief end of Liberal Unionism we could find no answer except this—to keep Mr. Gladstone out of power. We have scarcely had from any one of its leaders the barest outline of any scheme for the reconciliation of England and Ireland; all that they have done is to object to Mr. Gladstone's plan, and, when concessions are made in order to meet their views, to accord them a treatment which amounts to a practical declaration that they will not trust Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Chamberlain objects to Sir George Trevelyan's straightforward statement to this effect, but he does nothing to confute it. Indeed this animus was so apparent in the speeches at the Hartington banquet, and on many previous occasions, that a denial would have been a waste of words. Lord Hartington perhaps has shown less of this personal feeling than any of his colleagues, but Mr. Chamberlain has not shown himself free from it, and in Mr. Bright it is painfully conspicuous. If we compare the accounts given of the Round Table Conference, the conclusion at which we arrive is that Mr. Chamberlain's resentment of the confidence reposed by Welsh Dissenters in Mr. Gladstone—the feeling which found such keen expression in the letter to *The Baptist*—was one main cause of the failure of that conference. To speak frankly on this point, we must express our belief that Mr. Chamberlain did at that time really desire reunion, and that he had some reason to complain of the unmeasured attacks made upon him by some Welsh speakers; but had there been any sincere confidence in his old leader, that should have overborne such feelings, and at all events have induced silence until the last hope of reconciliation had faded away. How far a spirit of rivalry may have been fostered by such unwise friends as Mr. Jesse Collings, whose hostility to Mr. Gladstone is well known, it is not possible to say. But certainly the more we study Mr. Chamberlain's utterances the more impressed are we with the conviction that distrust of the old chief is at the root of much of his present political action. Mr. Bright does not attempt to conceal or tone down his own bitterness. His references to Mr. Gladstone in his

late speech are as humiliating to himself as they are insulting to Mr. Gladstone. He can find virtue everywhere except in his old friend and colleague. He, the great tribune of the people, can tolerate the faults of Tories, and even plead for the House of Lords, but for the man on whom a few years ago he lavished unstinted praises he seems to have no tolerance. It is very pitiful to hear him protesting that he is an older Liberal than Mr. Gladstone, and assailing with characteristic ferocity those who follow Mr. Gladstone rather than himself, as though the question were one of men, not of principles. He forgets that nothing is so likely to induce indifference to past services as a continual parade of them. Men rebel against this tyranny of the past, and demand rather sympathy with the living present. It is because Mr. Bright refuses to apply to Ireland his own principles that he has lost the confidence of the great body of Liberals, and has become the idol of a blatant Toryism. In his determination to make out a case against Mr. Gladstone Mr. Bright gives a version of the story of 1885, which would hardly be recognized by any one acquainted with the facts, and his policy is as reactionary as his history is inaccurate. He, the great apostle of peace and liberty, supports a system which keeps Ireland down by unequal laws, upheld by thirty thousand bayonets, and then talks as though there were no true Liberal but himself. It is not difficult to understand why the champions of privilege should hate Mr. Gladstone, and express their malignity in all varieties of vituperation. That men who still profess to be Liberals should share this passion against a statesman who has earned the hatred of reactionaries by his services to the cause of progress, and who even in his present action is at the worst only in advance of his old colleagues, is simply incomprehensible.

The critics of our veteran chief are legion. We may rather call them revilers, for it is seldom indeed that they undertake a careful analysis of the policy which they assail, still less a fair examination of the statesman on whom they pour out the vials of their wrath. We have come to such a pass that men who pride themselves on being English

gentlemen, peers of the realm, eminent scientists, and great reviewers seem to consider themselves warranted in casting off all the restraints of courtesy when they attack Mr. Gladstone. This Gladstone mania with its fierce outbursts of a passion that will listen to no reason is in some of its aspects extremely diverting, especially as we have the conviction that it is perfectly harmless except to its own wretched victims. Such ungoverned rage as that in which Mr. Buckle, Mr. Wilson, and the other writers of *The Times* see fit to indulge, never yet convinced any sane man and never will. If Mr. Gladstone were the worn-out and discredited statesman, bankrupt in political reputation and in public confidence which these writers represent him, he would not provoke this extraordinary frenzy of passion. The men who are possessed by the hatred of a great man whom they have not sufficient nobility of soul to appreciate, feel it necessary to encourage each other in this unworthy sentiment by professing to believe the reckless statements one or other of them is continually making. But their violence destroys their power and defeats its own purpose. We have only to sit down after reading one of their tirades and quietly ask what it all means, and the only feeling that remains is one of how men can have been so left to themselves as to believe that they can injure Mr. Gladstone by mere abuse which has not even the semblance of reason to justify its insolent rudeness.

A writer in *The Edinburgh Review* is one of the latest to take up a parable which has been repeated so often that we should have thought it must have become wearisome to those who have dinned it into the public ear. The Whig view is that "he is the man who, unlike M. Thiers' Conservative Republic, divides us most." We wonder where Edinburgh reviewers live? Where is the dwelling-place of the little clique who still help each other to believe that Whig ideas are still supreme, and that as Mr. Gladstone will not conform to them he must be displeasing to the great mass of the Liberal party? As a matter of fact, while Mr. Gladstone is in political life there is no other man who can unite us. Least of all can such a leader be



found among those who have called in the aid of the Tories to break the power of their old chief. Lord Hartington and his friends have not overthrown the influence of Mr. Gladstone. They have only dug the grave of the old Whig party. It may be that it is the secret consciousness of this which makes the Whigs so bitter. The power has gone from them for ever, and feeling this they cannot forgive the high-minded politician who has spoiled their game by loyal service to principles about which they talked, but from whose application they, like their fathers before them, recoiled.

The Tories of course are Mr. Gladstone's sworn foes. We do not blame them for their political antagonism, but for the virulence with which it is embittered. "Down with Mr. Gladstone" is their cry, and Mr. Jennings is its latest prophet. The extraordinary farrago of misrepresentation and abuse which he has published under the title of "*Mr. Gladstone: a Study*" hardly deserves serious notice. Anything less worthy of the name it is not easy to conceive. It might be more correctly designated "*A Billingsgate tirade*," for it is simply abuse—abuse without qualification, without scruple, without regard even to that salutary restraint which even a fierce partizan will put upon his own vehemence lest he should injure his case by over-statement. The railings of the modern Rabshakeh would be an appropriate title for a book whose only purpose is to revile. The book, however, is not without its use. It gathers into one all the accusations which the Tory party are continually bringing against Mr. Gladstone, and so helps us to understand what his real offence is. The consolation which remains to his friends at the close is that never did a great statesman whose life has been spent in the sight of his fellow-countrymen, come out of such an ordeal more triumphantly. Mr. Louis J. Jennings is an admirer of John Wilson Croker, has edited his writings, is in sympathy with his opinions. That a democratic constituency should have elected a man who apparently regards all the popular movements of the last half century with impartial hate,

and who here to-day looks back wistfully to the times of protection, is one of the phenomena of the day. But that such a Tory should hate Mr. Gladstone is not wonderful, and as he has written a book we turn to see what he has to say against him. There is literally nothing. He does not think as Mr. Jennings thinks, and that is all. Mr. Gladstone is a Radical, has grown to be a Radical. Can it be necessary to need fuller proof that he is a self-seeker? As to the worn-out stories about the Collier appointment and the Ewelme Vicarage, they served the party purpose of the hour, but there was not in them even the suspicion of any personal aim, and they have not left even a smirch on his stainless reputation. He has erred, as all men err; but it is the glory of England that she can point to a statesman who is emphatically *sans peur et sans reproche*.

Of course we have all the criticisms of his foreign policy, including the exaggerated representations of the Egyptian campaigns, served up to the delectation of all those who fancy that the one aim of the ex-Premier has been to humiliate his country. What could so possess a statesman whose name will be bound up with the glory of the nation over which he has governed so long when the Jenningses, Bartletts, and others of that ilk will be forgotten, as to make him desire the effacement of his country's influence is a question which never seems to suggest itself. Sufficient that by twisting some facts and misrepresenting others, some plausible case can be made out against him. It is not necessary to maintain Mr. Gladstone's infallibility in order to meet such a charge. Of course there were mistakes in his policy, but mistakes are not to be confounded with crimes, nor are all mistakes to be put down exclusively to him as though his hand had been perfectly free. Even Bismarck cannot always do exactly as he would, much less could an English Prime Minister, with a Cabinet in which were discordant elements, and with a Parliament in which was an obstructive Opposition that cared little what came of the country provided they could harass a political rival. We did not approve many points in the Egyptian policy, but so far as Mr. Gladstone's personal reputation is con-

cerned, it can be successfully vindicated. There is no reason to believe that the policy was his in any exclusive sense, nor is it clear that any other would have been more successful. There is not the faintest shadow of imputation on his honour or patriotism.

The rest of Mr. Jennings' book is made up of criticism to which the career of one who has always been learning, and who has been able to emancipate himself from the prejudices of the narrow school of Toryism in which he was trained, easily lends itself. If he had been a limpet fixed to the rock of old tradition his consistency would have been apparent. What some men cannot understand is the consistency of character which a man may preserve in the midst of those changes of opinion through which he must pass when emerging from a school of tradition and precedent, and passing out into the broader land of liberty and independence. It would be folly, however, to complain of Mr. Jennings because he cannot understand Mr. Gladstone, and worse than folly to enter into any refutation of his misrepresentations. They have not even the poor merit of originality, for they are nothing better than the sweepings of the Tory journals, or the mendacious gossip of the Tory clubs. In the opinion of Mr. Jennings and men of his type, Mr. Gladstone is the author of all that has been wrong in English policy for the last thirty years. Indeed, we may go even further back, for Mr. Jennings fixes on him the responsibility for the Crimean War. It is true he was neither Premier nor Foreign Minister at the time, but he made the speech which defeated Lord Derby's Government, and so was the author of all that followed on that defeat. It is idle to argue with men who talk in this fashion. As a book this "study" is worse than contemptible, but it is useful as an index of the stupid malignity of the revilers of Mr. Gladstone. No doubt Mr. Jennings thinks he has disposed of him. Alas for Mr. Jennings!

These Tory railings, however, have in them little that is abnormal and nothing that need be disquieting. It is the attacks of Mr. Gladstone's old colleagues, and above all of a friend so trusted as Mr. Bright, which are the

painful elements in the present situation. The names of Gladstone and Bright have so long been linked together in the hearts of all lovers of freedom and progress that it is hard to separate and antagonize them. In how many a home have their portraits hung side by side! In how many a conflict have their honoured names been an inspiration and a strength! Of how many an enthusiastic oration have they been the heroes! Alas! that this fellowship should have ceased. The severance of two leaders, whose political alliance seemed to be based on deep-rooted mutual respect, is one of the most deplorable incidents of the Liberal schism, sad enough in itself, but made infinitely more melancholy by the passion which Mr. Bright has infused into the strife. It is the fashion to treat Mr. Chamberlain as though he were specially the antagonist, but this determination to treat Mr. Chamberlain's action as the result of personal ambition and envy, has always appeared to us a grave mistake. Had it been so, he must have been of all politicians the most short-sighted. The dog of the fable, who dropped the liver out of his mouth in his endeavour to get at its shadow which he saw in the water, would afford an inadequate illustration of the folly of which Mr. Chamberlain would have been guilty had he deserted the safe path of party loyalty, and chosen the tortuous and devious course of selfish intrigue. In the former his reward was certain, and could not have been long delayed; in the latter it was only by something a little short of a miracle that he could have been saved from the disaster which has overtaken him. A politician who throws away his chances for the sake of a conviction has at least a right to be credited with sincerity. That personal feeling has subsequently crept in and has coloured Mr. Chamberlain's recent utterances can hardly be denied even by his friends, but there is nothing, even in the worst of them, which approaches the unmeasured invective with which Mr. Bright has seen fit to assail a veteran statesman and friend, the head and front of whose offending is that he has struck out a policy which, though it be the logical outcome of Mr. Bright's teachings in the past, does not commend itself to Mr. Bright at present.

Of all the Liberal chiefs, indeed, there is none from whom, both in personal and political grounds, Mr. Gladstone had more right to expect sympathy, and none certainly who has less ground to complain of his action. Theirs was an old and intimate friendship, and amid all the excitement of the past twelvemonths there has not been a solitary word spoken in relation to Mr. Bright by the friend whom he has not only forsaken, but has so fiercely criticized, to which he can reasonably object. Not only in public, but in private also, Mr. Gladstone refuses to express any hostility to Mr. Bright, and checks its utterance by others. Mr. Bright glorified by *The Times*, which once assailed his bosom-friend and companion Mr. Cobden after the same fashion in which it has recently attacked the Irish leader—the idol of those Tories whom he has so often denounced with all the passionate fervour of his noble eloquence—gratefully acknowledging the thanks of petty Conservative associations who have opposed every one of those measures of reform whose blessings he is never weary of reciting, and receiving all this homage as his reward for attacking Mr. Gladstone with a ferocity which reminds us of the malediction of Shimei, is a spectacle to move pity or indignation. Mr. Gladstone, however, has left to him a monopoly of passion and invective. For all that the Liberal chief has done is to seek to carry out the principle of justice to Ireland in measures which do not meet the approval of Mr. Bright. It is not difficult to pile up the agonies in angry declamation against Mr. Gladstone for failing to take his colleagues into his confidence, for shattering his party, and we know not what besides. But it all comes to this and nothing more. With the clear and penetrating insight of a true statesman, Mr. Gladstone saw that the demand of Ireland could not be trifled with, and that it should be met in such a way as to do justice to the Irish people without sacrificing the interests of the empire. Mr. Bright holds a different view, but he does not hold it more intelligently or conscientiously, nor has he any just reason to make this

difference the ground of a charge against Mr. Gladstone for inconsistency, such as was contained in his letter to the conference of Radical Unionists. "Having," he says, "turned his own coat so suddenly, he has no patience with Liberals of even longer standing than himself who refuse to turn their coats at his bidding." We say nothing as to the good taste of the language, except to express a regret that if Mr. Bright thought it necessary to bring such an accusation he should have stooped to the level of Lord Randolph Churchill in the style of his indictment. But there is no man in the ranks of the Dissentients who is less entitled to take this ground. Mr. Justin H. McCarthy, in his "Ireland since the Union," has brought together a number of Mr. Bright's former speeches relative to Ireland, which ought certainly to have justified the hope that he would have been one of the first to welcome a proposal of Home Rule. We do not say that he distinctly stated this as his conclusion, but assuredly it is the only conclusion to which his eloquent denunciations of English oppression lead up. As against coercion, his language was so strong as to leave nothing to be desired by the most ardent Nationalist. You may, he said, in relation to one of the abortive coercion measures of the past, pass this Bill—

You may put the Home Secretary's five hundred men into jail; you may do more than this, you may suppress the conspiracy and put down the insurrection, but the moment it is suppressed there will still remain the germs of this malady, and from those germs will grow up, as heretofore, another crop of insurrection, and another harvest of misfortune. And it may be that those who sit here eighteen years after this movement will find another Ministry and another Secretary of State, ready to propose to you another administration of the same ever-failing and ever-poisonous medicine.

The prophecy of the closing sentence has been fulfilled, but with this remarkable addition—the great orator who in such burning words exposed the folly and wickedness of coercion has now become one of its firmest supporters, and even sustains the most Tory of Tory Governments in the reactionary *coup d'état* in which it has coerced the Imperial Parliament in order to obtain weapons for repressing the

Irish people. The politician who is doing this is hardly the man to reproach Mr. Gladstone with turning his coat.

There is a want of chivalry in the attitude which Mr. Bright has assumed which produces a very painful impression upon all discriminating admirers. The quality is one of which a Christian politician might have been expected to afford special illustration, but in Mr. Bright it is conspicuous only by its absence. If conscience forced him to separate from one with whom it had been so long a pride to co-operate, all the circumstances of the case should have withheld him from swelling the chorus of vulgar abuse which is directed against Mr. Gladstone. He should leave such tirades to men like the Duke of Argyll, Lord Grey, Mr. Buckle, or Professor Tyndall. In all of them it is intelligible. But Mr. Bright is neither an arrogant landlord nor a disappointed statesman, an editor who hopes to win his spurs by flattering the passions and prejudices of the "Upper ten," or a self-complacent scientist who believes in the rights of a superior race, and has as little sympathy with popular feeling as he has a just appreciation of popular rights. These are all representatives of the classes, and are saturated with that class spirit from which it has been thought that Mr. Bright of all men was most free. It is a surprise, a disappointment, a sorrow, to find Mr. Bright in the ignoble company of the railers. We are not complaining of the difference of opinion, however we may regret it. We will not even object to the style of advocacy Mr. Bright has seen fit to adopt, though to us it is pitiful enough to find a nation judged for the faults of its leaders, and a great question of international right subordinated to personal considerations. Still if Mr. Bright thinks that the people of Ireland have shown their unfitness to rule by the choice of their present representatives, we must respect his conclusions however we may differ from them. But when he descends to the platform of Tory hate we can only say:

We cannot laugh, if such a man there be,  
We can but weep that Atticus is he.



The interchange of letters between these two great men encouraged the hope that Mr. Gladstone's lofty magnanimity had broken down, to some extent at least, the personal feeling which made Mr. Bright's utterances so distressing to those who still desired to retain the respect which they had cherished for him for years.

In Mr. Bright a strong Conservative element has always tempered his popular sympathies, and this has developed with his advancing years, until now it has attained a predominance which astonishes all but those who have carefully watched his career. Whatever else he be, he is not a Radical of to-day. He may be alive to the injustices and anomalies of some of our institutions, and would doubtless desire their removal; but he seems to have no heart for the aggressive action necessary to success, and on some of the objects contemplated by modern reformers he looks with distrust. No Liberal who is himself in touch with the popular movements of the day can think of John Bright as holding any longer the position he once occupied as a chief of progressive Liberalism. Radicalism needs one who has more of the buoyant spirit of his youth, who does not allow the brilliancy of past achievements to hide from him the necessity for still more strenuous conflict, and who instead of revelling in the glory of his own success, thinks nothing done while there is anything yet to do, and finds in the victories of the past encouragements and incentives to future effort. Happily we have such a man—one who unites in an unexampled degree the ripeness of age and experience with a hopeful confidence which even youth might envy—one who does not distrust progress because in its triumphs he cannot expect to share—one who, throughout the course of one of the most brilliant careers ever run by any English statesman, has kept himself free from all the subtle witcheries of Society, and maintained not only his integrity but his fidelity to unpopular principles—one who brings forth richest fruit in his old age, and, while others give way to the croakings of pessimist unbelief, never loses his faith in God and man. Therefore do the worshippers of the old idols of caste and

privilege hate him; therefore do the Tyndalls and the Bramwells, and all who lack true faith, revile him; but therefore do the people trust and love him. The late elections show that they are awakening to an understanding of the wrong that has been done him, and, as time passes on, their protest will be heard in still louder tones.

---

### THE IDEAL MAN OF CONFUCIANISM.

THE classical books of China\* speak much of a certain typical or ideal man who is represented as being a kind of personification of all human wisdom and virtue. The title generally applied to him is that of *Kiun-tsz*, which, literally translated, signifies a "royal" or "princely" man. The unbounded veneration in which the disciples of Confucius held their master not unnaturally led them to regard him as being one who perfectly exemplified the character of the *kiun-tsz* in his own life, and they frequently speak of him in this way. But however applicable or inapplicable to Confucius the statements may be which are made in the Chinese classics concerning this typical character, the *kiun-tsz* is properly an ideal and not an historical person.

It is interesting to contrast the humble estimate which Confucius formed of himself with the extravagant claims that have been made on his behalf by his admirers, both in ancient and in modern times. One of the sage's disciples, whose name was Tsz-Kung, having heard somebody revile his master, said, "It is of no use doing so, Chung-ne (i.e.,

\* See "The Chinese Classics," translated by the Rev. James Legge, D.D., Professor of Chinese in the University of Oxford. The quotations in this paper are all taken from the "Four Books" (vols. 1, 2). In the references given above, the following abbreviations are used. C. A., Confucian Analects; G. L., The Great Learning; D. M., The Doctrine of the Mean; Menc., Mencius. In nearly all cases Dr. Legge's translation has been followed.

Confucius) cannot be reviled. The talents and virtue of other men are like hillocks and mounds, which may be stepped over. Chung-ne is the sun or moon, which it is not possible to step over" (C. A. XIX. xxiv.). And again, on another occasion, the same disciple said, "Our master cannot be attained to, just as the heavens cannot be ascended by stairs" (C. A. XIX. xxv. 3). Tsz-sze, a grandson of Confucius, goes even further than this in celebrating the praises of his famous ancestor, and does not hesitate to ascribe to him something akin to Divine honours. In one passage, which, although it is not directly applied to Confucius, is nevertheless tacitly understood to refer to him, we are strongly reminded of some words in the Seventy-second Psalm, and of the predictions which that Psalm contains of the ultimate triumph of the Messiah's kingdom. "All-embracing and vast, he is like heaven. Deep and active as a fountain, he is like the abyss. He is seen, and the people all reverence him; he speaks, and the people all are pleased with him. Therefore his fame overspreads the Middle Kingdom (*i.e.*, China), and extends to all barbarous tribes. Wherever ships and carriages reach; wherever the strength of man penetrates; wherever the heavens overshadow and the earth sustains; wherever the sun and the moon shine; wherever frosts and dews fall: all who have blood and breath unfeignedly honour and love him. Hence it is said, 'He is the equal of heaven'" (D. M. xxxi. 3). Other passages occur in the writings of the earliest followers of Confucius supporting the view which is commonly held by the Chinese of the present day—*viz.*, that Confucius himself perfectly illustrated—nay, even *surpassed* his own description of what the "princely" or "ideal" man should be, and that he was naturally endowed with perfect human wisdom and virtue.

In talking with modern Confucianists, it is in vain that you quote the words of the sage himself, in which he expressly disclaims the honours which are bestowed upon him by his countrymen. "I am not one," said he, "who was born in possession of knowledge" (C. A. VII. xix.). "In literature I

am perhaps equal to other men, but [the character of] the *kiun-tsz*, carrying out in his conduct what he professes, is what I have not attained to" (C. A. VII. xxxii.). The eagerness of his followers to exalt their master's reputation for wisdom and goodness places them in an awkward dilemma. They explain away his confessions of ignorance and frailty by saying that these utterances of his do but prove his extreme humility. They forget that an estimate of oneself, which is untrue to *fact*, indicates either ignorance or something worse. But in spite of all such considerations the followers of Confucius will be found to maintain their belief unshaken, that Confucius is one alone, a man in whose character was no flaw, and one whose wisdom was practically infinite. They may in words, perhaps, assign an equally honourable position to a few of the wise and virtuous monarchs of antiquity, but for all practical purposes it is Confucius, and not Yaon or Shun, or any one else, who has led captive the hearts of the Chinese, and who to this day is revered in China with a reverence only surpassed by that which Christians pay to Jesus Christ.

In considering what the sages of China have said concerning their ideal of human virtue and excellence, it is only right that we should remember that their ideal is naturally somewhat coloured by the opinions and customs of the age and country in which they lived. That the ideal man of Confucianism falls far short of the Christian standard of perfection is unquestionable, but at the same time most persons will be ready freely to admit that in the "princely" character described in the sacred writings of China, the Chinese have before their minds an ideal which has not often been surpassed.

I have already said that Confucius expressly disclaimed all right to be considered a *kiun-tsz*, or "ideal man," himself. In as far as he has described the character of such a person, he has described a standard by which he was endeavouring to mould his life, rather than a standard which he felt he had actually reached. The quotations given in the following pages, in illustration of the character of the

*kiun-tsz* as he is described in the Chinese classics, are not all from the lips of Confucius himself. Some of them were uttered by his immediate followers, some by the famous philosopher Mencius, who flourished B.C. 371-288, i.e., about a hundred years after the death of Confucius.

There is a short but characteristic sentence attributed to Confucius which expresses concisely the manifoldness of the ideal which he had before his mind in all that he said about the *kiun-tsz*. This sentence, translated boldly and literally as Dr. Legge translates it, sounds to European ears almost ludicrous. "The *kiun-tsz* is not an utensil" (C. A. II. xii.), but interpreted as these words are by Chinese commentators—and probably their interpretation is quite right—the sentence is to be understood as meaning that the ideal man is one who is equal to every emergency. Every utensil has a special use of its own, and is fit for nothing else. Not so the ideal man. You cannot take him at unawares, or find any task to which he is not equal. A somewhat similar thought is expressed elsewhere in slightly different language. "The *kiun-tsz* can find himself in no situation in which he is not himself" (D. M. xiv. 2). "He does what is proper to the station in which he is: he does not desire to go beyond this. In a position of wealth and honour, he does what is proper to a position of wealth and honour. In a poor and low position, he does what is proper to a poor and low position. Situated among barbarous tribes, he does what is proper to a situation amongst barbarous tribes. In a position of sorrow and difficulty, he does what is proper to a position of sorrow and difficulty"\* (D. M. xiv. 1, 2). But the superiority of the *kiun-tsz* to ordinary men does not rest on any supernatural gifts or endowments which he possesses and they do not. He is not a being endowed with miraculous powers over Nature, neither is he one possessed of second sight. His wisdom is not of such a character as to preclude all possibility of his ever being deceived or

\* Compare the words of St. Paul (Phil. iv. 11-13), where the apostle claims to possess these identical characteristics of the "ideal man," but simply in virtue of his union with Christ.

mistaken. All that is claimed for him in this respect is that he will not err in regard to right and wrong. He may be misled as to matters of fact, but not as to matters of principle. Mencius illustrates this point by an anecdote. "Some one sent a present of a live fish to Tsz-ch'an of Ch'ing. Tsz-ch'an ordered his pond-keeper to keep it in the pond, but that officer cooked it and reported the execution of his commission, saying, 'When I first let it go it appeared embarrassed. In a little while it seemed to be somewhat at ease, and then it swam away joyfully.' Tsz-ch'an observed, 'It had got into its element!' The pond-keeper went out and said, 'Who calls Tsz-ch'an a wise man?' After I had cooked and eaten the fish, he says, 'It had got into its element!'" Mencius adds, "The *kiun-tsz* may be imposed on by what seems to be as it ought to be, but he cannot be entrapped by what is contrary to right principle" (Menc. Va. ii. 4). The ideal man, however, is not one who can be easily deceived. Although chiefly conspicuous for his moral superiority, his integrity and uprightness of life and conduct, he is, as we shall see, by no means wanting in shrewdness and general intelligence. "He does not anticipate attempts to deceive him, nor think beforehand of his not being believed, and yet he apprehends these things readily when they occur" (C. A. XIV. xxiii.).

But the cultivation of *character*, and the proper discipline of his thoughts and affections, are the chief objects of solicitude to the *kiun-tsz*. Confucius always recognized the supreme importance of watchfulness over the secret thoughts and intents of the heart. Summarizing in one sentence the general drift and teaching of one of the most ancient of the sacred books of China, he says, "In the Book of Poetry are three hundred pieces, but the design of them all may be embraced in one sentence. Have no depraved thoughts" (C. A. II. ii.). Chinese moralists have always laid great stress on the fact that the virtues of the truly good man are not incidental or occasional, but are the natural and spontaneous outcome of a hidden life within. With them, not less than with ourselves, morality

is held to consist in habits, not in isolated actions. The sage or holy man of the Chinese is one "who naturally and easily follows the right way" (D. M. xx. 18). "Without effort he hits what is right" (*Ibid.*). So clear is his intellect that he even "apprehends without thought" (*Ibid.*). All this is the result of his perfect sincerity and singleness of aim.

"The *kiun-tsz* regards the attainment of sincerity as the most excellent thing" (D. M. xxv. 2). In the same spirit he eagerly pursues the right way in every department of thought and action. "In everything he uses his utmost endeavours" (G. L. Comm. ii. 4). "If there is anything he has not studied, or while in what he has studied there is anything he cannot understand, he will not intermit his labour" (D. M. xx. 20). Confucius said, "The object of the *kiun-tsz* is Truth (or, the right way). Food is not his object, . . . he is anxious lest he should not get Truth; he is not anxious lest poverty should come upon him" (C. A. XV. xxxi.). "[In everything] he considers righteousness to be essential. He performs it according to the rules of propriety. He brings it forth in humility. He completes it with sincerity" (C. A. XV. xvii.). The importance of doing right and being right is always present to his mind. Fearing self-deception he feels the necessity of being "watchful over himself, when he is alone" (G. L. Comm. vi. 1). "Not even for the space of a single meal does he act contrary to virtue. In moments of haste he cleaves to it. In seasons of danger he cleaves to it" (C. A. IV. v. 3). He allows no considerations of self-interest to warp his judgment, and no prejudices to bias his decisions as to the path of duty. "He does not set his mind either for anything or against anything; what is right he will follow" (C. A. IV. x.). In whatever he does he displays the utmost self-control, as well as earnestness of purpose. "In his food, the *kiun-tsz* does not seek to gratify his appetite, nor in his dwelling-place does he seek the appliances of ease. He is earnest in what he is doing, and careful in his speech; he frequents the company of men of principle in order that he may be rectified" (C. A. I. xiv.).



We have seen that the *kiun-tsz* of Confucianism is an ideal and not an historical personage. But although Confucius had never met with any one who in all points answered to his ideal of life,\* he nevertheless frequently adduces the examples of the sages of antiquity, or even of some of his own contemporaries, as illustrating, in some measure at least, the character on which he delighted to dwell. Thus we have the example of one called Hwny mentioned as an instance of contentment and resignation in the midst of poverty. "Admirable indeed was the virtue of Hwny! With a single bamboo dish of rice, a single gourd dish of drink, and living in a mean, narrow lane, while others could not have endured the distress, he did not allow his joy to be affected by it. Admirable indeed was the virtue of Hwny!" (C. A. VI. ix.). "Such was Hwny," said Confucius on another occasion, "that for three months there was nothing in his mind contrary to perfect virtue. Others may attain to this on some days or in some months, but nothing more" (C. A. VI. v.). Hwny was a favourite disciple of the sage, but, to his master's great distress, he died at an early age. But Confucius' most unqualified praise was reserved for the examples of perfect virtue afforded by the ancient, semi-mythical emperors, Yaon and Shun—men whose names are still held in the highest possible veneration in China, on account of the wisdom and righteousness which are said to have characterized their reigns. A disciple of Confucius named Tsz-loo asked on one occasion what constituted the ideal man. "The master said, 'The cultivation of himself in reverential carefulness.' 'And is this all?' asked Tsz-loo. 'He cultivates himself,' was the reply, 'so as to give rest to others.' 'And is this all?' again asked Tsz-loo. The master said, 'He cultivates himself so as to give rest to all the people. He cultivates himself so as to give rest to all the people; even Yaon and Shun were still solicitous about this' (C. A. XIV. xlv.). From this and

\* Confucius said, "A sage (Shing jên) it is not mine to see; could I see a (or the) *kiun-tsz*, that would satisfy me" (C. A. VII. xxv. 1). Contrast Matt. xiii. 16, 17.

other passages it appears that the goodness of Yaon and Shun, whose examples Confucius held in such high esteem, was not by any means simply a passive goodness. The virtue of a truly good man must always be active and aggressive. It must seek to extend its influence to others. "The *kiun-tsz*," said Confucius, "wishing to be established himself, seeks also to establish others: wishing to be enlarged himself, he seeks also to enlarge others" (C. A. VI. xxviii. 2). The philosopher Mencius speaks to the same effect. "To take example from others to practise virtue is to help them in the same practice. Therefore there is no attribute of the *kiun-tsz* greater than his helping men to practise virtue" (Menc. II. a. viii. 5). But in order to help others to do right a man must first of all be right himself, for "if a man cannot rectify himself, what has he to do with rectifying others?" (C. A. XIII. xiii.).

The Chinese have an almost unbounded confidence in the power of a good example to influence and reform the lives of those who observe it, and they are rather too ready to take for granted that a good man by the mere fact of his goodness will not fail to make others good. At the same time they believe, as the above quotations show, that a good man will endeavour directly and actively, as well as by his example, to "establish" and "enlarge" others, and to help them in the practice of virtue. In all such endeavours he will, as might be expected, display his own princely character, "to show forbearance and gentleness in teaching others, and not to revenge unreasonable conduct; . . . the *kiun-tsz* makes these things his study" (D. M. x. 3).

It would not be difficult to multiply quotations from the Chinese classics, in which the "princely" or "ideal" man of Confucianism is referred to, and in which various traits of his character are described—his indifference to worldly fame and reputation (C. A. I. i. 3); his caution and moderation in speech (C. A. II. xiii., and XII. iii.); his veneration for the good, and his patience with all men (C. A. XIX. iii.); his firm adherence to what is right (C. A. XV. xxxvi.)—these and many other excellences are all parts

of the whole character which is held up continually before the Chinese as the highest type of human wisdom and virtue. But it is not necessary to follow the description given of the *kiun-tsz* into all the minutiae of his life and conduct; it is enough to notice some only of the more important features of the picture before us—indeed, it is by describing the character of the ideal man down even to the smallest details of his outward demeanour, that the sages of China have done something to mar their work, and to bring their ideal into contempt, at least amongst inhabitants of the West. The excessive attention which the Chinese, as a nation, pay to matters of etiquette and propriety in small things can never do otherwise than strike Europeans as childish and ridiculous, and this trait in their national character naturally finds expression in their sacred writings. No European admirer of Confucius can fail to have his admiration for that great man in some degree chilled by reading the tenth book of the Confucian Analects, in which we have particulars of the sage's life recorded, which represent him as being formal and punctilious to the last degree in his attention to the veriest trifles of his dress, his manner of walking, sitting, bowing, &c., &c. It may be said that Confucius is not responsible for the folly of those who thought fit to chronicle all these trivialities, but the fact remains that there is a certain stiffness and formality which seems inseparable from the Chinese ideal of perfect virtue, and which Confucius and the other sages of China have sanctioned both by precept and by example, and this tends to lower rather than to raise their ideal in our eyes.

As the Chinese classical writings speak much of the *kiun-tsz*, or "princely" man, so they speak also of a *siao jên*, or "small" man. In this way Chinese writers on morality frequently bring out the virtues of their ideal character into bold relief by putting it into immediate contrast with the character of a man of opposite disposition and opposite aims. As the *kiun-tsz* is the personification of all that is noble and good in human nature, so the *siao jên* is the personification of human nature in its most

base and contemptible aspects. "The *kiun-tsz* thinks of virtue, the *siao jên* thinks of comfort" (C. A. IV. xi.). "The mind of the *kiun-tsz* is conversant with righteousness; the mind of the *siao jên* is conversant with gain" (C. A. IV. xvi.). "What the *kiun-tsz* seeks is in himself; what the *siao jên* seeks is in others" (C. A. XV. xx.). Not only are the two men different in themselves; in their conduct towards others, and in their intercourse with others, they manifest entirely opposite tendencies. "The *kiun-tsz* is easy to serve and difficult to please. If you try to please him in any way which is not accordant with right, he will not be pleased; but in his employment of men he uses them according to their capacity. The *siao jên* is difficult to serve and easy to please. If you try to please him, though it be in a way not accordant with right, he may be pleased; but in his employment of men he wishes them to be equal to everything" (C. A. XIII. xxv.). Again, the "small" or "mean" man is wanting in that reverence which always characterizes true greatness. "Confucius said, 'There are three things of which the *kiun-tsz* stands in awe. He stands in awe of the ordinances of Heaven. He stands in awe of great men. He stands in awe of the words of the sages. The *siao jên* does not know the ordinances of Heaven. He is disrespectful to great men. He makes sport of the words of the sages'" (C. A. XVI. viii.). The contrast between these two different types of character may be summed up in a single sentence: "The progress of the *kiun-tsz* is upwards, the progress of the *siao jên* is downwards" (C. A. XIV. xxiv.).

And here it may be said that the Confucian ideal of human excellence does not exclude the notion of progress. The *kiun-tsz* is not one who is, so to speak, found ready made. Neither is he one whose character is perfect in the sense of leaving nothing more to be desired or even conceived. What the *kiun-tsz* has attained to is within the reach of every one, but the goal is only to be reached by toil and discipline. "The way of the *kiun-tsz* may be compared to what takes place in travelling, when, to go to a distance, we must first traverse the space that is near, and when in

ascending to a height we must begin from the lower ground" (D. M. xv. 1). "The way of the *kiun-tsz* may be found in its simple elements in the intercourse of common men and women; but in its utmost reaches it shines brightly through Heaven and Earth" (D. M. xii. 4). "Tsz-kung, a disciple of Confucius, said: 'The errors of the *kiun-tsz* are like the eclipses of the sun and moon. He errs, and all men see it; he changes again, and all men look up to him'" (C. A. XIX. xxi.). But the errors or failures of the *kiun-tsz* are all of them remediable, and are only such as are incidental to a life of which moral growth is a recognized principle; they belong to the earlier steps of the course by which he attains to the highest ideal. "In archery," said Confucius, "we have something like the way of the *kiun-tsz*. When the archer misses the centre of the target, he turns round and seeks for the cause of failure in himself" (D. M. xiv. 5).

The last feature in the character of the ideal man to which I will allude is his habitual calmness and composure. "The *kiun-tsz* is satisfied and composed, the *siao jên* is always full of distress" (C. A. VII. xxxvi.). "The *kiun-tsz* has neither anxiety nor fear. . . . When internal examination discovers nothing wrong, what is there to be anxious about? What is there to fear?" (C. A. XII. iv. 1, 3). Self-examination is a duty frequently inculcated in the Chinese classics. The calmness and inward peace of the *kiun-tsz* springs from an honest conviction that he is not cherishing any evil in his heart. "To look up and have no occasion for shame before Heaven, and below to have no occasion to blush before men—this is one of the delights of the *kiun-tsz*" \* (Menc. VII. a. xx. 3).

From the sketch which has now been given of the ideal man of Confucianism, it will be seen that he is one in whom the religious instinct seems scarcely to exist. He guides his conduct almost exclusively by reference to an abstract law of right; he is a complete stranger to the higher motive of seeking to please God. Surrounded on all hands by

\* Cp. the almost exactly similar thought expressed by St. Paul (Acts xxiv. 16).

brothers—for Confucius practically taught the doctrine of an universal brotherhood among men \*—the *kiun-tsz* of the sacred books of China never raises his thoughts to a common Father in heaven. The silence of Confucius on religion, and on the relation of man to God, can hardly astonish us. We may perhaps agree with Mr. Maurice that it is an “evidence of Confucius being a sincere man that he did not allow himself to use mere figures of rhetoric upon this subject, for such in his lips they would have been.” But so long as human nature remains what it is, a godless philosophy like that of the Chinese can never meet its deepest needs. How little Confucianism has really satisfied the heart and mind even of China may be seen from the almost universal prevalence of idolatry in that country at the present hour. The deficiencies of any system of teaching, however, cannot diminish from the value of what is positive and true in that teaching, and the more the sacred literature of China becomes familiar to us, the more we shall perceive how much there is that is positive and true in Confucianism, and how many points of contact there are between Christian and Confucian thought, the better fitted shall we also be to supply that which is lacking to the Chinese, and to do so in such a way as is most likely to ensure its acceptance by them.

ARNOLD FOSTER.

#### DR. PHILLIPS BROOKS ON TOLERANCE.†

DR. PHILLIPS BROOKS is a conspicuous example of a broad, enlightened, and generous spirit, asserting itself in the

\* Cp. C. A. XII v. 4. Some one complained that he had no brothers. Tsz-hea, a disciple of Confucius, quoted in reply the following saying, which has been generally attributed to Confucius. “Let the *kiun-tsz* never fail reverentially to order his own conduct, and let him be respectful to others and observant of propriety, then all within the four seas will be his brothers. What has the *kiun-tsz* to do with being distressed because he has no brothers?” “Within the four seas” may be taken as a description of “the Middle Kingdom,” i.e., China, but for Confucius and his contemporaries China was the world.

† *Tolerance*. By PHILLIPS BROOKS. (Macmillan and Co.)

midst of countervailing influences of the most potent kind. We should be showing our own inability to appreciate these nobler elements of his character were we to suggest even by the most indirect way, that the church of which he is so distinguished an ornament, stood alone in its intolerance. Alas! the recent action at Andover and the attitude of the American Board of Foreign Missions towards all who cherish a larger hope even in relation to the heathen who have never heard the gospel are sufficient to show that narrowness is not peculiar to any one creed, and that even in communities whose life has been one long struggle for liberty, the spirit of intolerance may assert itself. Still it is not unfair to say that the Episcopal system, especially when developed on High Church lines, is peculiarly favourable to the growth of an arrogant and exclusive temper. Possibly it is owing to the reaction which the pretension of Anglicanism produced among ourselves that we owe what is certainly extraordinary and is at first sight almost inexplicable—the more liberal spirit which prevails in the Nonconformist Churches of this country as compared with kindred communities on the other side of the Atlantic. We know of nothing more offensive to all who are beyond the pale of the Church, than the bearing of the great body of the Anglican clergy. The Roman Catholic priest holds a theory of his office and its rights quite as exclusive, but he does not make it so obnoxious to those whom his Church teaches him to regard schismatics. No doubt the fact that the Anglican is under the same condemnation of the Catholic Church as ourselves makes us resent all the more keenly the quiet assumption that we have neither Church, nor ministry, nor sacraments, when made by those who are fellow-rebels against authority. But there is a peculiar tone, especially in the dignitaries of the Church—due not only to the fact that they are a privileged class, but perhaps even more to the identification of that class with the proud autocratic caste which seems to believe that England is its own inheritance. These English ideas appear to have been imported into America, and we are told that the Episcopal Church there



has caught the spirit of its parent, and to some extent has even exaggerated it. Indeed we have this gravely adduced as an agreement against Disestablishment. If it proves anything, it is that the spirit engendered by sectarian ascendancy is not alone responsible for that separation of the Anglican clergy from all other ministers of Christ. How this can be a reason for constituting them a privileged order, and so strengthening in them the very tendencies which ought to be repulsed, is not obvious.

Granted, however, that American Episcopalianism has not wholly escaped the influence of descent, example, and association, it must be said that in Phillips Brooks it has trained a man to whom we have no parallel here. We are not disposed to undervalue the high-minded spirit displayed by some of the English clergy. With the record of the conflict which has just been waged in Convocation before us, we should be not only ungrateful but unjust if we did not recognize the gallant stand which some of the best men in the Church made on behalf of Christian liberty and tolerance. But we doubt whether even they have gone to the roots of the question and have mastered the great principles as Dr. Phillips Brooks has done. His speech on the fellowship with other churches, which attracted so much attention, not only indicated a nobility of spirit and a breadth of individual sympathy which did him the highest honour, but also showed that he realized the necessity of the really Catholic spirit in order to the victory of the Church in its conflict with evil. This view is confirmed by his selection of "Tolerance" as the subject of two lectures to the Divinity students of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Surely no topic could well be of greater practical interest and value, and as he truly says in his opening remarks :

It seemed as if there were no group of men to whom one could so fitly speak upon it as a gathering of students of theology. To them more than to other men must come the puzzling problems and interesting suggestions which the whole subject of tolerance involves.

It has to do indeed with the spirit in which their work is to be conducted. Tolerance is really sympathy, and sym-

pathy is one of the essential qualifications for all kinds of Christian service, most of all for the ministry of the gospel. Our author quotes with approval the apparent paradox, but really profound truth, expressed by Frederiek Maurice when he says that charity is founded, not as often supposed, on the *uncertainty*, but on the *certainty* of truth. It is only the man who is free from panic, or even anxiety, who feels that God will vindicate His own truth, and who, because of the very depth of his own convictions and full assurance of his own faith, is able to survey the conflict with a feeling of absolute calm, who can really bear the burdens of others who are under the sway of what he regards to be error. In true tolerance there is no air of superiority, no suggestion that we are foregoing some right in enduring what we ought rather to suppress, no tone of commiseration or patronage. It is here that we draw a distinction between toleration and tolerance. In the former there is this air of condescension and even concession, as though something were given which might fairly be withheld. The very essence of tolerance is a recognition of the perfect equality of men. It is the embodiment of the great apostolic principle, that it is not only the right, but the duty of every man to be fully persuaded in his own mind—for his decision there is but one Master to whom he has to answer. Dr. Phillips Brooks thus defines it:

Dr. Holmes, in his Life of Mr. Emerson, declares that "the word 'tolerance' is an insult as applied by one set of well-behaved people to another." No doubt there are insulting tones enough in which the word may be used; but the word itself is not insulting. It expresses a perfectly legitimate and honourable relation between two minds and natures which there is no other word to express. Here is my friend with whom I entirely agree; his thoughts and convictions are the same as mine. I do not tolerate him; there is no place for toleration there. Here is my other friend, who disagrees with me entirely. I disagree with him; but I respect him. I want him to be true to his convictions. And while I claim the right and duty of arguing with him, and trying to show him that I am right and he is wrong, I would not silence him by violence if I could. I would not for the world have him say that he thinks I am right before his reason is convinced. Now, that is tolerance. Is there any insult there? Is not that a

recognizable, manly position for me to stand in as regards my friend? Is either his manhood or mine injured or despised? But is it not clear also that the healthiness of this tolerance which is in me toward him depends on its integrity? It is because both its elements are there that it is a sound conviction worthy of his soul and mine. Take either away, and the element which is left becomes insulting. But then it is not tolerance which is insulting; for this is not tolerance; for tolerance is the meeting in perfect harmony of earnest conviction and personal indulgence (p. 11).

Tolerance must be "cordial, discriminating, outspoken, conscientious." In thus insisting on its positive qualities, Dr. Phillips Brooks has redeemed it from the obloquy under which it has sometimes rested, as though it were nothing better than an amiable good-nature which was not sufficiently in earnest to resent the insults and injuries done to the truth by unbelief and error. He shows that it is, in fact, the highest service which can be rendered to truth, and one to which, in its highest forms, they only are equal whose own souls are fully possessed by the truth. Very interesting is our author's philosophic analysis and historic survey, but the most valuable part of these lectures is the application of the principles so firmly laid down and illustrated with so much lucidity and beauty. We can do nothing better than allow him to speak for himself. How profoundly true is his remark to the students as to how they may become ministers of tolerance: "The true way in which you can be that is to forget tolerance and be ever more and more completely men of truth and men of Christ."

The real unity of Christendom is not to be found at last in identity of organization, nor in identity of dogma. Both of these have been dreamed of, and have failed. But in the unity of spiritual consecration to a common Lord—so earnestly sought by every soul that, though their apprehension of Him whom they are seeking shall be as various as are the lights into which a hundred jewels break the selfsame sunlight—the search shall be so deep a fact, so much the deepest fact in every soul, that all the souls shall be one with each other in virtue of that simple fact, in virtue of that common reaching after Christ, that common earnestness of loyalty to what they know of Him. There is the only unity that is thoroughly worthy either of God or man. That seems to many men, I know, to be dim and vague. It is a terrible and

sad sign of how far our Christianity is from its perfection, that now, after these centuries of its sway, the central key and secret of its power should seem dim and vague to men. But the hope of the future, the certainty of the future, is that the personality of Christ, as holding the loyalty and love of all the varying orders of mankind, and making them one in their common affection and obedience to Him, is to become more and more real with every Christian generation, till it is at last for all mankind, as it is now for multitudes of earnest souls, the reallest things in all the world. Organizations and dogmas are of aid as they help to that. When that shall come, in the degree in which that shall have come in any age, tolerance will fill that age as it at last must fill the world with its great, active, thoughtful, stimulating, sympathetic peace. It must follow from all this that tolerance is to come about, not by any transaction, not by any compacts and bargains, not by deliberate concession and compromise, but by the rising flood of life (pp. 55-7).

Again, as to the practical act of tolerance—

There is not a Church in Christendom—not our, nor any other—which is not forced to own that there are men whom she will freely acknowledge to be Christian men, whom yet she is not ready and fit to receive into full communion and membership with herself, into full acceptance of her privileges and full enjoyment of her influence. Some dogma doubted, or some dogma held, or some peculiarity of thought or feeling on their part, stands in the way. Some excess or some defect of faith keeps the Christian outside the Christian Church! Is it not so? I can see nothing to do but frankly to face the fact and own it. A man comes to you, who are a minister of our Church, and tells you of his faith, tells you how earnestly he loves, how deeply he honours the Lord Jesus Christ; tells you how he is trying to give his whole life up to the Master's service. Is he a Christian? Of course he is; you cannot doubt a moment. You are sure what the Lord would have said if He had met him in Jerusalem. But can you, simply and solely because he is a Christian, throw wide the door and bid him welcome to our Church's inmost privileges? Are there no tests of doctrine, no specified ways of worship, no definitions of orthodoxy, which lie within the definitions of the absolute truth, which you must apply before you can bid that Christian welcome to the Church and feel that he and it belong together? If there are, then the Church is not prepared to-day to make herself identical with Christianity. If the chance to do so were freely given her and she is not ready to accept it, then she is not catholic; she is not prepared to lay claim to universality (pp. 78-80).

It is impossible for us to follow Dr. Brooks in his further illustration of this theme. We only hope that the extracts given will lead our readers to go to the book themselves.

### THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF METHOD.

THE sins to which saints are prone are often those which lean to virtue's side. The evil with them is not naked and unashamed. It is clothed with garments of propriety and sometimes borrows from the angels' wardrobe. Thus in St. Paul's time there were those who did evil that good might come. The end justified the means. They pretended to quote some saying of Paul's in justification of their tenet (Rom. iii. 8). They affirmed that the apostle both taught and practised the abominable principle that men might do evil in order to bring about good results.

This is, as we know, the sop which some men who have gone wrong have thrown to conscience. They have embarked on doubtful and speculative business so as to increase the value of property entrusted to them, and, as they hope, to make some confiding friend benefit by their transactions. Others have carried on businesses of doubtful morality, or have received wages of injustice and oppression in the delusive expectation that they would be able to do a vast amount of good with the proceeds. These transactions have only to be stated boldly in order to be unmasked.

But it is otherwise with those temptations which assault and often overcome men of otherwise strict Christian integrity. Here we find that the methods pursued are not so clearly wrong as to receive instant and universal condemnation. Some men's sins are open, going before to judgment. But these are veiled, and they walk by our side and seem as though they, at least, will befriend and defend us before the last tribunal. At their worst they are only doubtful expedients, only things open to question, only means which some men of stringent principle condemn.

For if the great object be the spread of God's gospel, it seems as though the splendour of the aim would flood each method employed with at least a borrowed light. The purpose is so sublime, and the difficulties are so enormous, that the Church is often tempted to stoop to conquer. Ways and means sometimes partake of a very worldly

character, and this character is justified and defended on the ground that the purpose is to save souls. But the Church of Christ needs to learn, not only to maintain a good cause, but to fight with honourable weapons. There is an appropriateness in all method. It rests on an undefined harmony between the method and the aim. A dancing man may possibly at length move us to tears; but if that be his aim he takes a curious way to reach it. To conquer men for Christ is serious work, and it should be proceeded about with great gravity.

Pierce to the centre of the phrase, so often used with approval, "We must attract the people," and what do we find? To what, to whom, are we to attract the people? To our places of worship? To our ministers? But these are only means. To bring them to instruments and rest there, is not to do the work for which the Master sent us. It is no doubt a pleasant and delightful thing to see crowds filling our sanctuaries; and there is certainly nothing very enviable in empty benches. But has the "glory" descended on the sanctuary, and is it so resplendent that all who enter will see and fear the Christ who is worshipped and preached? We have not solved the question of the age when we have set the multitudes agog with mere curiosity, or tickled their fancy with meretricious ornament. Christian service is heart work.

All that hinders the fulfilment of Christ's purpose with men's souls is surely unchristian method. Suppose that the Christian Church thinks so exclusively of its own interests as to neglect the pathetic spiritual wants of the multitudes around; suppose it virtually says that every one who comes regularly to hear the kingdom of God expounded must pay for the privilege, and that its minister, choir, and edifice are for its own spiritual sustenance mainly—is not all this a flagrant instance of the unrighteous method? Imagine our missionaries going to China and proceeding on the same principles. How many hearers would they obtain from the frugal and heathen Chinese? I am well aware that we are in a far different position from that occupied by a land of pagans. And yet

it is well known that there are hundreds of thousands in our country who are in exactly the same moral darkness as the heathen. If we have a mission to them, we shall have to alter our tactics entirely before we reach them. Within living memory it has become a custom to hire halls and theatres in order to do so. How long will our conservative Churches be before they learn the lesson, and throw open in suitable localities some one service every week as a purely propagandist meeting?

Sermons are the wonderful means which God uses for the conversion and consecration of souls. At college, students are most carefully taught how to prepare logical outlines, and how to unfold the meaning of a text. Every sermon must have an exordium (as though every house had a porch), and its heads (as though a man must count his fingers as he speaks), and an application (as though the soldier must necessarily make a bayonet charge when he has already killed the enemy). One good thing a minister may always do with his college sermons—burn them. Their end is to be burned.

There are some who make an annual holocaust of their discourses. Their example is perhaps worthy of imitation. But like the Ephesians, who brought their books to the bonfire, the burning needs to be done with discrimination. "What did you intend to do in that sermon?" asked a minister of a young man. The question was sudden and startling. It is a very necessary one for older men. It would be a wholesome query before preaching: "What do I intend to do, or to get done, in this sermon?" The righteousness of method would at once assume a very grave importance. Fireworks! Shooting-rockets of rhetoric going out of and into darkness! Catherine-wheels of dazzling words, pleasing the eye, but leaving no trace on the mind! Such are some of the means by which we suppose the cause of Christian truth to be forwarded. Others go to the exactly opposite extreme, and suppose that no method is the right method; and that want of preparation and mental cogitation is a sure sign of grace. But grace abhors a vacuum as much as nature. We may try to serve



the Lord with that which costs us nothing, but in the long run the lamp without oil will consume its own wick. The foolish virgins may stand as symbols of foolish teachers who teach nothing, and of foolish preachers who proclaim only their own emptiness. With such lamps of the temple it matters not where they are put. It is all one: wherever they are they give no light.

During the eighteenth century the Methodists were the great preachers of method. They were accounted mad; but a discerning eye could see that there was method in their madness. What was it? Trace back the movement to its rise in Oxford, and you find young men gathered together for prayer and study of the Holy Scriptures. It was this private communion with God which gave them new life; and the new life burst the old bottles. There was no particular merit in taking, as Wesley did, a tombstone for a pulpit. There was no special virtue in the open air as a place for preaching the gospel. Many a man standing on a tombstone would be indistinguishable from his pulpit. It was the life of God, which these men obtained and embodied, which made them powerful. Others might come after and copy their ways, but they could only catch their life by lively fellowship with Christ. Copyists they might be. But parrots do not become men, however cleverly they speak.

There is one method which has received the most emphatic and solemn sanction of God. It is persuasion. In physical and natural matters we see the power of coercion. But in the realm of the spiritual, coercion, in any form, is an example of an unrighteous method. The winning of the will to Christ's authority is essentially a work of suasion. Though children have to be hedged round with all kinds of prohibitions, yet, to evoke their deepest life, love must be used, and love does not keep coercion in her armoury. She leaves this to law.

But men are often so completely swallowed up with the grandeur and necessity of the end they have in view as to forget that persuasion is as vital to Christianity as the atonement. The one has to do with means, and so, too,

has the other. The union of the Church with the State is a conspicuous example of the deadly influence of a wrong method. It is a union which is supported by men of devout piety and of great powers, and whose ardent attachment to the gospel is undoubted. And yet see what this error as to method has led these holy men to do. It has led them to accept a Prayer Book contaminated by sacramentarian poison, and to work side by side with those whose one desire is to make England bend her neck to priestism. And the strange result has also been brought about, that there is no interchange of practical and public service between such people and those with whom, by belief and spiritual kinship, they are most closely allied. They have both forsaken good Christian fellowship, and have taken up with a communion which hampers them at every onward step they wish to take. This may satisfy the indifferentist who cares for no form of truth. But to those who care for the gospel of Christ, and to whom it is vital, this attitude is a schism they cannot too deeply deplore.

The same tendency is sometimes observable in our legislative efforts. It is, no doubt, possible to make people outwardly sober by Act of Parliament; but it is not possible to make them sober-minded. If we seek to touch their inward and moral life, their life of thought and purpose, by the rough instrumentality of law, we shall find ourselves at fault. We are drawing earnest workers off the right scent by any extravagant expectations in this direction. The longest way round is often the shortest road. When you have to persuade people, you must not throw all your powers into forcing them along the path. A reserve of moral force must be maintained. The indirect result of social legislation is often more influential than the direct: because it may lead public opinion to concentrate itself on needful reforms. But if, unfortunately, it should lead people to fancy that all is done that can be done, it will work much harm. Begin at the home. Begin with the young. A Roman Catholic prison chaplain, after twenty-one years' prison experience, has retired, and is henceforth going to devote his labours to the juvenile popu-

lation. This is a significant determination. It is one which ought to suggest to Christian people of all denominations the need for more earnest and constant efforts among the young. By all means let us have legislation where it is needed. But it should be kept in a secondary place—in our thoughts and plans. An Act of Parliament seems to many people a thing done and finished. It is after all only a thing begun, and too often it is a statute which cannot be enforced. This is especially the case with those acts which trend upon the moral and social life of the people. Divide and conquer. Bring pressure to bear from ten thousand Christian workers on hearts and homes; and there may be no acclamation, but there will be execution.

If this question as to the morality of method is pertinent in politics, it is much more important in Church work. Yet Churches are often afflicted with a nervous desire to make a display, or to reach the multitudes by unworthy plans. The plans may themselves not be unworthy, and yet they may be so absorbing as to become themselves the end. When the fisherman has made a fine net he may think that his work is done, whereas it has not yet begun. The Salvation Army may not be guilty of any fault in beating the big drum, nor the Ritualists in burning incense or in having an ornate service. But if the gaping crowd are like the sheep to whom Milton refers in "*Lycidas*," who "look up and are not fed," there is something sadly wanting. The art of Christianity is not to collect people, but to convert them; not to astonish, but to admonish them.

The danger of Congregational Churches is in the other direction. They often imagine that their modes of work are almost a part of revelation. It is instructive to note that the people most free and liberal in the best sense as to doctrine and government are often the most conservative as to methods. The jealousy as to the interference of one Church with another is like all jealousy, a dangerous passion. It has interfered with much necessary co-operation. The country districts wait to be invaded by

free Church life and Evangelical religion. But the ark of old method, with its stony tables, must not be touched. The masses of our towns and cities are open to lively, homely talks on Sunday evenings, such as the Apostles James or Peter would have loved to give. But we must not depart from two lessons, two prayers, four hymns, a chant, and a textual sermon. The method first, and the people after. There are not wanting signs that this old order changeth, giving place to the new. And if the change is the result of new life from the Holy Ghost, our hearts leap for joy at the revolution. When the new reformation comes this paper will be out of date. It will not be needed. Method will settle itself. The life of the tree will break the flower-pot to pieces. Old humdrum ways will be put into the world's lumber-room with the stage-coach and the tinder-box. The love of the gospel and the love of souls will teach us all that we need to know. But meanwhile we deprecate the idea that we can love souls without loving the gospel. It is not real love of souls that makes Churches raise money by doubtful expedients. It was not love of souls that made the Corinthians spend large sums on their feasts, while the apostle, who had begotten them in the gospel, was left to support himself by tent-making. It is not love of souls that leads Churches to spend more on their organ or spire than on the servant of the Lord Jesus Christ who speaks to them the word of life. It is not love of souls that leads to the swelling of the Church roll with people who show no signs of real spiritual life. The two kinds of love must be combined if we are to have a new lease of Christian power. *If*. Why do we allow ourselves to be hindered by an *if*? The Son of Man is waiting at our doors, and all that He requires from us is obedience to Him. A new method of living, thinking, planning, worship, work, and of believing on our part, would be the opening of the sluice-gates for the flood-tide of God's river to flow into our country. It only needs a new inward method for the beginning of a new inward fire. When the fire begins to burn, the world will soon know. Let each Christian soul cry, "Lord, light that flame on my heart!"

SAMUEL PEARSON.

## A PLEA FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.

It may fairly be assumed that the story of Foreign Missions has, so far as earnest Christians are concerned, settled all questions as to the solemn obligation to make disciples of all the nations. Of course those who regard faith in the Lord Jesus as the one Saviour of men as fanaticism, may still hold that our efforts to convert nations who, they are pleased to say, are superior to ourselves as Pharisaic assumption; but to the man who has a simple faith in God, the history must end all controversy. That controversy, indeed, can have respect only to modes of action. The august authority of the Lord has laid His Church under an obligation it cannot question. All power is His, and to His servants has He entrusted the duty of bringing all men under His sway. It is only as to the wisdom of particular methods of fulfilling His command that there can be doubt. God Himself has borne witness to those who have consecrated their lives to this Christlike enterprize by "signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will." As He gave to the first preachers of the cross, so has He given to these latter-day apostles gifts of spiritual insight, of stainless loyalty, of heroic daring, of unwavering faith, of tender and compassionate sympathy. These gifts have been sanctified to the attainment of results as marvellous even as those recorded in the annals of the early Church. We have a long list of names from Carey down to Moffat, to say nothing of those who are still continuing the same illustrious line, not unworthy to find a place in this true Apostolical Succession; while the story of the conversion of the islanders of the Pacific, or of the martyr Church of Madagascar, of the trials and triumphs of the cross among savage tribes such as those of whom Eliot was the apostle, or those less brilliant but not less manifest, and, rightly viewed, even more remarkable successes which have crowned the faithful efforts of the noble company who have laboured in India or China, would cer-

tainly furnish a proper supplement to the Acts of the Apostles. What we contend is that the story of Foreign Missions proves that the work is of God. In view of the miracles of grace recorded on every page of our missionary annals, he would be a daring man who should undertake to challenge the wisdom or even the Divine authority of this work in heathen lands.

It is not avowed hostility that we have to dread, and especially not hostility resting upon any scriptural basis. But in the absence of this there may be a failure to estimate the full measure of responsibility in connection with it, and a consequent tendency to deny it its proper place in the affection and service of the churches. The purest hearts may need to be stirred by strong representation and earnest appeal, especially in relation to duties which lie outside the range of their daily experience. The poor, the suffering, the sinful of our own land, we have always with us, and we cannot be indifferent to them unless we stifle the Divinest instincts of humanity, and quench every movement of the Spirit in our hearts. But the heathen are far away, and imagination fails to realize their actual state; and though it may not be possible for us to persuade ourselves that they have no claim on our sympathy and effort, at least we may plead that our obligations to our own neighbours and kindred so immeasurably outweigh those of other nations that we may properly postpone thought of the latter until we have more adequately satisfied the more urgent and imperative calls of the other.

Such a view is so plausible that it might deceive the very elect. It is not what Phillips Brooks so well describes as "the venerable argument which was never very strong, and which halts and stumbles now from age and long dishonourable service"—the argument of those who taunt Christians with the sins of England, and laugh to scorn the idea of preaching to Hindoos and Hottentots a gospel which has not done more to purify the hearts and lives of Englishmen. The plea with which we propose to deal is that of men who themselves have a sincere

faith as to the power of the gospel, but who have hearts and hands so occupied with the work that lies at their doors—in which they can themselves take a share, of whose results they can judge, and whose successes bring a certain joy and honour to themselves—that they do not allow foreign missions to have that thoughtful consideration which would give a right impression of their grandeur and importance. England is not yet fully Christianized; their own town has yet to be brought within the kingdom of God; and, until that is accomplished, the utmost they can bestow upon the work of converting the heathen world is a kindly sympathy not very strong or operative; a patronizing word of encouragement in which there is yet a suppressed note of regret that so much has been taken away from the service so greatly needed at home—perhaps some miserable contribution cast into the exchequer with reluctance, and by its amount supplying the most convincing evidence that this grandest of all religious enterprizes has failed as yet to possess the imagination and to fire the heart.

The worst feature in this state of mind is that it is regarded as a high development of a practical Christian wisdom. The enthusiast who cares for the people of India and China is put in contrast with the patient worker in the "slums," as the type of a dreamy sentimentalism as distinguished from a self-denying and practical philanthropy. One of our great novelists has supplied the catch-word for those who love this style of criticism, and a reference to *Borrioboola Gha* is thought sufficient to discredit the self-denying zeal of those who feel that the gospel is God's word of love to the whole world. But nothing could be more untrue to fact. There may be, probably is, false sentiment in relation to Foreign Missions, but so is there also in relation to every kind of Christian work, and, indeed, as some recent disclosures have shown, to all the activities of benevolence. Perhaps ridicule is the most effective weapon which can be directed against the caricature of what is purest and best in our nature, but there is need for care lest in getting rid of the counterfeit injury be done to that which ought to be most jealously



guarded. Sentiment is at the root of all noble work in the service of man, when it is genuine, has in it the most Divine elements in human character. It is its very preciousness which leads to the miserable imitations which are too often passed off upon us as the jewel itself, but a merchant who should cast away pure diamonds of Golconda because he has once been imposed upon because of his contempt for paste, would be as wise as the philosopher who betrayed his want of spiritual insight by sneering at Christian sentiment—the faith, the impassioned zeal, the uncalculating devotion, the greatly daring courage of Christians who believe that the world is Christ's, and are ready to give of their best in order that it may be won for Him—because there may also be found in the ranks of the Church a maudlin sentimentalism which substitutes mere gush for intelligent devotion, or worse still, a thinly-veiled selfishness which hopes to promote its own ends by aping the attitudes or employing the phrases of a consecrated zeal. Sentiment is essential to the loftiest type of Christian character, and it is one of the arguments in favour of Foreign Missions that they foster and encourage it in its noblest forms.

Still it might seem as though the objector who insisted that England must be won for Christ before a crusade is undertaken against heathenism had much to say on his own behalf, and indeed that the balance of argument was on his side, were it not that the history of Christianity tells so powerfully in the opposite direction. It would hardly be too much to assert that the apostles at first inclined to the narrower conception of their duty, and that they were forced out of it by the teaching of events. But it is certain that they did not leave Jerusalem until they were forced out by the strong hand of persecution. And as it was with the first, so was it with each successive step in advance. The conception of the world-wide character of their mission did not at once present itself to their minds—did not present itself at all except as the Lord Himself, by His guiding providence, enlarged the sphere of their vision. It was ever the same leading finger which beckoned them on,

leading them to fields unknown and toils whose ultimate issue they were unable to forecast. "The Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light." They would have preached to the Jews only, but the Lord led them by a way they knew not out into the Gentile world. Even there they were not permitted to rest in the cities where the first Gentile churches were planted. Nothing, indeed, could have seemed more reasonable. These churches needed consolidation and education, for their members were but babes in Christ, and the first thought of the apostles ought surely to have been for them. Take, for example, the Church at Antioch. True it was full of the glowing zeal of first love, and in it were many fitted to do great service for God. But in that great city was a field wide enough for all their efforts. Surely there was the post of duty for the two great leaders of the Church. The young converts wanted training; the city had to be evangelized. So, doubtless, the practical men of the day would have argued. But God's ways are not as our ways. Barnabas and Saul, and the people by whom they were surrounded, had other work to do, and at His bidding the Church at Antioch sent them out as missionaries.

Even more striking was the direction to Paul himself. His work in the East seemed but just begun when he was called to leave it and to pass onward. There was clearly some great law in this, or he would not have been summoned from a field so vast. Asia was teeming with people. Its cities were among the most populous, the most influential, the most wealthy in the world. They were centres of the world's commerce, and as possessing that cosmopolitan character which necessarily belongs to the great emporiums of trade, where all nationalities meet, seemed specially fitted to be centres for Evangelistic work. Here was a field sufficient to fire the ambition and employ the energy of the most devoted. It was hardly touched when the man of Macedonia was sent to Paul with the call that summoned him to Europe, and so explained the secret of that baffling of his plans in a way which must have sorely perplexed

and troubled his spirit. The Lord had plainly taught him that the time was come for Europe to receive the gospel. It was but a continuation of the same process which had been going on from the first. Everywhere there was a little leaven cast into the barrel of meal, and it was left to work as a sanctifying influence, whose work was to be gradually done, while they who had cast it in were to press on and do the work in other lands.

The same law holds good still. And when we consider how long the truth has been at work in this country and what a multitude of agencies are employed in order to bring its influence to bear on the ungodliness and sin which are still around us, we may surely feel that any plea in arrest of effort to send this gospel that it may be preached for a witness to other nations is miserably feeble. Through the centuries God has been speaking to us as a people. By the teaching of His Providence, by the messages of His servants, has He been instructing us in the knowledge of His will and calling us to obedience. Great, great in spiritual qualities as in number, has been the company of those who in this land have published the word of His salvation. To none has been given more of that blessedness which belongs to them who hear the joyful sound. It has been set forth in loftiest words of sanctified eloquence, it has been chanted in strains of sweetest music. We have it scattered in our homes, so that if there be an Englishman who has never heard that the name of his Father in heaven is Love, and that in His love He is seeking to win every sinner back to Himself, the fault is his own. The word is nigh him—at his very door. There are Christian sanctuaries, if he will enter them; Christian teachers, if he will hear them; Christian influences, if he will welcome them. All possible variety of means have been employed to bring the truth of God home to his heart and conscience. Alas! we have still vast tracts of territory unreclaimed from the power of sin, but these wastes of British Paganism are surrounded by the influences of Christianity, and at least we have a gathering of forces to work upon them, such as has no parallel in any part of the world.

It is no part of our intention to suggest that these are too numerous, or that too much of thought and energy is employed or can be employed in seeking to multiply their number or increase their efficiency. We are seeking only to present a consideration which is only too easily forgotten and which needs to be strongly emphasized if we are to appreciate the claims of Foreign Missions. We urge it chiefly as a reply to those who seem to act on the principle, more or less distinctly expressed, that England should be fully Christianized before the labour of the Church be diverted to other lands. History teaches us that has not been God's method; and if we seek to act upon it we are sure to reap disappointment. England has had her opportunities: she has them still. In her midst are numbers of Christian men who have only to be true to their own trust to make it certain that every one of her children shall hear the message of salvation.

It would not be easy indeed to calculate the effect which England would exert upon the world if the gospel had a more mighty power over her own children. It has often been pointed out that some of the most serious hindrances to the success of our missionaries are those which arise from Englishmen who bear the Christian name, but whose lives would be a scandal to Paganism itself. Could these hindrances be converted into helps, were all Englishmen, whatever their special calling, witnesses for Christ to the heathen with whom they trade or whom they are set to govern, what an enormous access of power would there be to the men whose one business is the preaching of the gospel. It would be preached, though in another yet not less powerful manner, in every Court of law where English rule was a synonym for justice tempered with mercy; in every market where the name of Englishman inspired confidence in the stainless honour and uprightness of the trader; in every society where English influence told on behalf of the things which are true and honourable and just, pure and lovely and of good report; in every home where the graces that sweeten and beautify life were the living testimonies to the power of the gospel on the heart. The most ardent

zealot for Foreign Missions cannot be indifferent to the conversion of his own fellow-countrymen. There ought not to be in rightly governed Christian hearts—hearts full of love to God, and the true enthusiasm of humanity, there can be no opposition between these two kinds of service. They spring from the same motive, they are acts of loyalty to the same Lord, they seek the one end. Each, in truth, is so far an auxiliary to the other, that we cannot separate them without injury to both. He is unfaithful to his Lord who would depreciate the necessity. All that we are seeking to do is to draw attention to a view of the subject which is apt to be overlooked. Not only patriotic feeling, but the highest considerations of Christian expediency, enforce the necessity of efforts for the salvation of England far beyond any which have yet been employed. But if we are to compare the two departments of Christian work, we must not leave out of account the enormous advantage which belongs to this country in the large number of Christian professors living among its people. Let them be true to their Lord, and Home Missionary work will never languish. It is not to be denied that there is need for more direct effort for the salvation of men in this country; but, after all, our most urgent and crying need is a more complete and attractive exhibition of Christianity in the lives of its professors. In the absence of this we may multiply our preachers, organize our missions, employ every variety of method to win men, but the work of all will be largely neutralized, as it is neutralized at present, by the influence of half-hearted, luxurious, self-indulgent—worse still, inconsistent Christians. Give us men of a nobler stamp; servants of God whose one aim is to do His will in all things, consecrated men whose entire lives are inspired by love to Christ, faithful witnesses for truth and righteousness, enthusiasts for Christ, and there will be no lack of the instruments for carrying the word of salvation to every British home and preaching it to every British heart. We admire the ingenuity shown in the devising of new agencies; we rejoice in the enlarged conception of the true functions of the Church of Christ; we devoutly thank God for the

generous benevolence and active philanthropy of devoted labourers—but beyond and above all these we want a large-hearted, practical godliness. Our home work needs money—money for works of charity as much as for the ministry of the word itself,—money for the feeding of the hungry, for the teaching of the ignorant, for the brightening of sad and sombre lives. But we want even more the influence of noble men and tender women. In not a few of our own Congregational Churches there are more Christians than we have sent out for the conversion of the great empire of China. Are there not in some more than are employed in the entire heathen world? If every one of these was a messenger for Christ, would there be any complaint that the labourers are few? If they fail in their duty, can that be a reason why we should keep back from the heathen world the message which God has sent to it? In fine, the attempt to put one kind of service against the other is worse than misleading. They are part of the same great obligation which rests on every one to whom the gospel has been the power of God unto salvation, and the neglect of one will sooner or later be to the injury of the other.

Personal service for Christ at home is imperative on every man who loves his Lord, and, when faithfully performed, is itself an education. But we contend that there is a special fitness of Foreign Missions to develop some of the higher qualities of Christian character. In the first place it may be said that we cannot rise to a true conception of the gospel until we realize all that is implied in the Lord's own words—"The gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a testimony to all the nations." The gospel is not an expedient for the deliverance of a small number of men from the consequences of their sin. It is the message from the Father to all His children, charged with all the tender compassion of His love, assuring each and all of a place in His heart, calling them all to return to the joy of His fellowship. To us has the word of this salvation come, and on us rests the duty of sending it on to those who have not yet heard it, till there is not left one of the

children of our Father who has not heard the wondrous story of that Father's redeeming love. There is the *rationale* of the missionary enterprise, its history and its natural history as well. The Lord said, "Write the vision and make it plain upon tables, that he may run who readeth it." Each new reader becomes himself a messenger in his turn, until the great purpose of the Divine love has been accomplished.

A Christ for all men—all men for Christ. In that there is something to strengthen our faith as well as to fire our zeal. There are few if any objections to Christianity in which there is more to stagger even those who have the simplest and fullest trust than that which is based upon the limited range of its influence. Is it credible (it is not unreasonably asked) that the love of God can have revealed itself in such wondrous manner, and that the result is only the salvation of a "little company" who, if truth be told, have no special qualities which mark them out as specially worth saving? The Incarnation is itself a transcendent mystery, but it becomes more mysterious still when we think of it as the means to an end apparently so far below this lavish expenditure of the Divine grace. The infinite condescension of the Son of God, the bitter experiences of a life spent in the midst of unbelief and sin, the cruel humiliation inflicted by His foes when He, the sinless One, was numbered with the transgressors, the tears, the agony, the cross—are these all to end in the deliverance of the few? Do they not all point to a purpose of God far transcending anything we have seen, anything we have even dared to imagine? If this be the revelation of the Father's pity to all His children, if the end be that these wanderers shall all hear the call of His love, the grace is still so marvellous that our hearts are bowed in wonder and in gratitude by this manifestation of the Divine compassion; but we can at least see in such a message of reconciliation something worthy even of a God. And we, to whom has been given this blessed privilege that we have heard and believed the call, are inspired by the longing desire to make known to every one of His children the



gospel which has been the message of life and peace to ourselves.

But the wider the sphere in which our sympathies move, and the larger our thoughts as to the work we have to do, the greater the demand upon the highest qualities of the Christian character. It is not enough that we take a part according to the measure of our ability in enlightening, or instructing, or persuading those within the range of our personal influence, or that we have some little spot which we seek to redeem from the misery and desolation of sin. All this we must do, but we must also help on this wider and grander enterprise of the conversion of the world. True, in thinking of that we are made painfully conscious of our littleness and insufficiency. But even that is a healthful discipline. In the work which we can do ourselves there is the temptation to ascribe too much to our own wisdom and power. We may fall into the snare of which the prophet warns us, burning incense to our own net and sacrificing to our own drag. It is our work, and we may fancy that we have done it. So we may come to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think. But our share in this great missionary service is so small, so pitifully small, that the temptation to indulge in a spirit of vainglory is almost removed. What is the little that we can do in presence of the immense demand upon the energy of the Church? We might withhold it, and it would hardly be missed. We gave it, and it is hardly an appreciable addition to the force which the Church is employing. True, we know that if behind it is the spirit of consecration—though it be but the mite which we cast into the treasury—yet that it is not scorned of Him who has promised that the cup of cold water given to a disciple in the name of a disciple, shall not be without its reward. But the result, in which is our reward, is unknown to us. It may be our little offering has been made useful to the conversion of a soul, and that soul one to which God has given great spiritual power for the conversion of others. It may have sent a New Testament into a heathen home, and that Testament may have converted one who has

become an apostle to his own people. So our little seed has become the parent of a glorious harvest. But we know it not.

We obey the impulse of Christian love as we cast our gift into the collecting box. It has cost us some sacrifice, and now it has passed away from us. Whither it goes or what it does no voice comes to tell us. It is only our little contribution to this work of conquering the world for Christ. It is lost in the mass, and henceforth we cannot trace its course. It requires the exercise of a strong faith to realize that, though we cannot tell how, it is telling upon the great mass of heathenism and sin. A word spoken to a neighbour, a lesson given by a teacher in the Sunday school, a trifling act of charity to some starving family, a grasp with a loving hand of one who else would have been lost in the mire of vice, can be followed, and no purer joy can gladden human heart than that which comes to us when we have the evidence before us that this trivial service has not been without result. But it is faith only that can cheer our hearts with the thought that the subscription or offering on the plate which we deem so poor may yet be rich in its fruits. We cannot see the issue, but it is the Master who has said, "Blessed are they who have not seen, yet have believed."

We must not pursue the thought, or we might show how it is not only faith that is thus strengthened and matured by missionary work. That this grander conception of the aims and purposes of the gospel should purify and ennoble the entire man is, indeed, only in harmony with the great spiritual law—"The soul of the liberal shall be made fat." The heart grows rich in giving, and so the old words are fulfilled, "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth; there is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth only to poverty."

There is nothing so likely to shake our faith in the gospel as a dwarfed idea of its place in the Divine economy. Regard it as the religion of a nation or of a class, and it is not wonderful that doubt should disturb the heart. Listen to it as the Father's word of pardon and recall to His wandering children, and the very divinity of the idea is a

witness to its truth. But as that thought possesses us, as we share in, however small a degree, the Master's own enthusiasm of humanity, our hearts become more unselfish, more full of generous purpose and lofty desire, more tender and yet more brave—in short, more like that of Christ. Can there be an education of the soul more ennobling, or more fitted to bring us into true sympathy with our Lord, than a true and living consecration to the work which filled His heart when He came to seek and to save them that were lost?

---

### THE FIRST GREAT CRISIS IN THE CHURCH.

No attentive reader of the life of our Blessed Lord can be other than struck with what, looked at in any way, or from any point of view, is a strange and admirable thing: viz., the calm, all-assuming confidence with which Jesus looked forward to the whole race of man listening to the story of His earthly life and the record of His death; together with His people's persistent effort to tell that story to all as the Church's greatest duty and highest honour. Two special illustrations of this will come to the forefront of memory with all Bible readers. One is the account of the woman who anointed the Lord in the house of Simon the leper: of which act the Saviour said, in answer to the mean economy of the apostles: "Whosoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her." This saying, in prospect of an ignoble death and burial, and in circumstances that are altogether alien from any warrant of such a hope, tells much of the inner thought of Jesus; and shows Him as one, the horizon of whose hopes stretched beyond the near foreground of the life of a generation or two, and, in truth, was not coterminous with the earthly history of the human family. The other instance was in surroundings that were as little likely to justify the expecta-

tion of universal dominion, though very different from the scene in the leper's house. It was in what St. Matthew gives as his last recorded words of Jesus. It was that assumption of supreme authority in heaven and earth, on which the Lord grounded His people's loving allegiance; and by which He enforced the duty of His Church to disciple all nations in the doctrine of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This He strengthened still more by the over-sweeping promise or assertion, "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." From that august moment, it is evident, Christ's vision overlooked the ages; and saw the nations everywhere learning of Him; being taught by His Church, as the height of all human duty on earth, to "observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

With such things green in their memories, it would be natural to expect that the apostles and the body of believers under their care, would, at the least, have felt their hearts opening before the pressure from within of a vast hope and desire for all men; and would have strained the full energy of their ability towards revealing unto all men without distinction the unsearchable riches of Christ. Surely, it might be thought, John's heart would have followed his Master's; and his eyes have been with his heart, in a love-lighted and prophetic vision of all men listening to the love of God the Father in Jesus Christ. Without doubt, it might be imagined that Peter's impetuous nature would have caught fire from his Master's glowing hope, and in that flame all barriers between him and others would have been burned away. Surely he would have seen only the expectation of Jesus waiting its sure fulfilment. Surely to Peter the middle walls of partition between men would have been broken down. And so might it have been expected of the whole apostolate and church in Jerusalem. What, however, are the plain facts of the apostolic history? They are such as show the spotless honesty of the writer, and a daring faith that could put down for after ages everything needed for true instruction and edification, even though it might be at the risk of a somewhat sullied repute for the

apostolic body, and a diminished estimate of the intelligence and charity of the Jerusalem Church. For it is clear from the first eleven chapters of the Acts of the Apostles that neither the Church nor the apostles at that time thought of going beyond the narrow circle of Judaism with the gospel of salvation. The wide sweep of St. Paul's thought; his fuller vision and more faithful apprehension of the purpose of the Father and the meaning of the death of Jesus do not seem to have drawn their eyes. The horizon of Jesus was, at that time, too wide for the apostles. Perhaps, in the church at Jerusalem and in the whole apostolate, there could not have been found one man, unless it were Barnabas, to whom the unrestricted preaching of the gospel to all nations would have seemed other than presumptuous and unauthorized. The story of the way in which the Church was emancipated from its bondage and narrowness is one of the most important sections of apostolic history. Opening, as it does, the first great crisis of the Church, it witnesses to the presence of Christ with His people, and to that gentle leading of His most tolerant love which shone among the apostles during His earthly life; when, "having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end;" notwithstanding their petty thoughts of His kingdom, and in spite of their rivalries for place and power in His dominion.

The crisis and the emancipation began with Peter; and the story opens in the account of his mission to Cornelius the centurion. But before this it is significantly enough recorded that Philip the deacon, flying from the persecution that raged against the Church upon the death of Stephen, went down to Samaria, there working many miracles, and bringing many of the people to Christ. Upon receiving news of this the apostles, who had remained in Jerusalem, sent Peter and John to examine what had been done. To the preaching of the gospel in Samaria there seems to have been no great objection. Perhaps the semi-Judaism of the Samaritans and the remembrance of how Jesus had visited and won converts in Sychar had force in influencing the apostolic judgment. Again, when Philip was sent to the

Ethiopian eunuch no censure was passed upon his reception of such a man: the truth probably being that he was a proselyte to Judaism. The Jewish circle was, even in these instances, still the contracted area of church work.

This is more evidently and sadly the case in the events linked with the mission to Cornelius. The piety of Cornelius, the true piety of prayer and good works, is emphatically stated. Its acceptance with God is notably affirmed. Yet it is no less clear that this man was regarded by the apostles and the Jerusalem Church as being outside the pale. The message of Jesus was not for him so long as he was uncircumcised. It is certain that only too much countenance was given to the Gentiles in their belief that Christianity was but a form of Judaism. The preparatory vision given to Peter, in which the true Jew speaks, presumes an objection on Peter's part, to have fellowship with the uncircumcised. The universal cleansing, the Divine abolition of the scornful judgment between things common and sacred, clean and unclean, was not yet recognized by the apostle. But the vision cleared his sight, strengthened his faith, widened his thought of God, and ennobled his actions, for awhile at least. Peter's perplexity about the vision gave place to recognition of the Divine love as being broader than the measure of a Jew's mind. The fog of national bigotry and sectarianism was lifted from his thought. He even saw farther than he understood. Though he never seems to have grasped the universal love of God as Paul did, yet in this incident Peter knew more of the truth than ever previously; and to some extent the truth made him free from the fetters of the Jew. How powerful Jewish narrowness was, or had been in his spirit, even in thoughts of the work of Jesus, is manifest from Peter's first words to the friends and kinsfolk of Cornelius in Acts x. 27, &c. And how the old curse of a base nationalism and sectarianism still lurked in his mind, and how he fought against it, can be seen in this,—that when the Holy Ghost fell on the whole company of Gentiles, and the six Jew companions of Peter were "amazed because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy

Ghost," without affiliation to Judaism; Peter turned to his comrades, as if fearing that they might oppose what he was about to do, and said, "Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" The silence of the six gave consent. So the Church, in the person of Peter and six other Hebrews, was committed to stepping over or breaking down the middle walls of partition: and was started on its true path of faith and love,—the faith and love that recognize, assert, and enforce among men the great truth concerning the family of God, that no earthly religious, social, political, or national distinction is to stand for a moment athwart the coming together of all, as brethren in Him with whom "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free." The Church was now to be compelled to learn that man, because he is man, is dear to the Eternal Father, and within the compass of all the hopes and efforts of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Such a great step, such a startling innovation, not to say outrage, on all that had been dear to the Jew, could not be taken without difficulties rising. Light is slowly received. Even religious men, perhaps they most of all if there be anything sectarian about them, cast the old skin of partial truths, or errors, most slowly and painfully; and in the process are most sensitive and irritable. Peter must have foreboded trouble when he went back to Jerusalem: and it certainly was ready for him. Before he reached the capital the tale of what he had done had been told. With evident heartburning, and a nursing of what they thought was righteous indignation, "they of the circumcision" waited for Peter's return. Their charge was ready. They were prepared to arraign even such a man as Peter. If he were not put on his trial, yet Peter had in a fashion to stand on his defence, as before a session of the Church, for breach of custom and unauthorized acts. Very wisely Peter confined his answer to a simple statement of what had taken place; and with a comprehension of his six colleagues in the honourable censure, he finally, warming with his



defence, and more like the true Peter than he showed himself later in his life in a similar controversy, said, "Who was I that I could withstand God?" Then, as men amazed, "they held their peace and glorified God, saying,—then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life!" Their thoughts of God, their judgment of the work of Christ, and their conception of the Church's duty may be judged from their own words.

Meanwhile, a movement in the same direction of liberty and universality had been going on elsewhere. Away from what seems ever to have been the benumbing shadow of the Jerusalem Church, the spirit of the love of Jesus showed itself in a great longing for "all to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." Flying from the persecution in which Stephen was offered up to God, some of the lowly, unknown believers who were in Jerusalem at that time, "laymen" as they would now unhappily be called, "travelled as far as Phœnicia and Cyprus and Antioch, speaking the word to none save only to the Jews." The ecclesiastical and ritual prejudices of their race clung to them, as to others, like a curse. But there were some of the wanderers who were of a greater spirit, a nobler mould, a diviner heart: and these, "men of Cyprus and Cyrene, when they were come to Antioch, spake to the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number that believed turned to the Lord." This is more notable, more influential, nobler altogether than the act of Peter. They had no authority given by vision from heaven, no appeal from the pious to stimulate their zeal, or suggest that even among the Gentiles there might be some who feared God. They were simple-hearted, earnest private members of the Church, who spontaneously and deliberately did that which Peter would not have done; and which it needs no imagination to picture the rest of the apostles questioning. Whether this preaching to the Gentiles took place before Peter's visit to Cornelius cannot be determined, but it seems likely. And if so, it is to the unnamed, unknown brethren, to the wandering martyrs for the faith in Antioch, that the high

honour of first showing the broad spirit of the love of Christ to all men must be given. The first real act of true mission work for Christ; the earliest recorded deed of obedience to the world-wide command of Jesus; the first true comprehension of the spirit of the Lord wrought out in holy, loving act, is to be associated, not with the apostolate, not with prominent believers whose names are in the apostolic records, but with the few bright and noble-hearted fugitives in Antioch, of whom it can only be said—"their names are in the Lamb's Book of Life." For the time Antioch was of more interest and importance than Jerusalem; and the doings of the exiles were of more consequence than the acts of the apostles. Like many, very many of the most useful and blessed events in the history of the Church and of nations, this great act of self-emancipation and consequent enlargement of the Church, came from the lowly, the unrecorded, the almost forgotten—save by God.

The mission work in Antioch, joined with the act of Peter, could not but be a grave business to what may be readily called the mother church. They who had been quick to judge and censure Peter would not be eager to endorse the record of the doings at Antioch. Peter, with a vision and evident signs from heaven, would be to those of the circumcision in Jerusalem, a different person from the private believers who had crossed all the prejudices of the Jew, without waiting for sign from heaven or commission from earth. It was a crisis of the Church's history in which some of the most momentous questions waited answer and decision. Unwise action at that time might have committed Christianity to a long course of ignobility and narrowness, the marks of which would have lasted to this day. If there had been unwisdom shown, it could not rightly be regarded with surprise. Seeing how dim the vision of many believers is even now, as to the sweep of "the love that passeth knowledge," it would be an easy matter to expect too much from Christians eighteen centuries ago, when "the report concerning the things done in Antioch came to the ears of the Church which was in Jerusalem." And nothing could more truly witness to the

Spirit of Wisdom being given to that church, in fulfilment of the promise of Jesus, than the action taken at that time. The story at this point is suspiciously brief: as if the writer would pass over almost in silence something that it would not be of use to any for him to write. The commission of Barnabas (for that was the action taken) was too serious a thing to have been lightly decided. And when it is found in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles that the church at Antioch, a little while after, was troubled by some from Judæa, who would have destroyed the good, broad foundation laid by the martyr exiles, and who "taught the brethren, saying, Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved;" and when it is seen that they caused such misery by their narrowness and ignobility that "Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and questioning with them," and had, at last, to go up to Jerusalem to consult with the apostles and mother church on this very matter; and when it is read that at that council some of the church at Jerusalem "rose up and said, it is needful to circumcise them, and charge them to keep the law of Moses;" it will not seem likely that the commission of Barnabas, the most charitable of all at Jerusalem, was a step that was easily, brightly, and unanimously decided. But it is the sending forth of Barnabas that is the bright spot in the crisis. He was the one man who was fit, by largeness of heart and self-sacrificing love, and also by intelligence, to judge the believers in Antioch, and wisely estimate their work. His greater fitness—say than Peter's—is clear from what Paul tells of Peter's doings when he came to Antioch, in the Epistle to the Galatians, chapter ii.: "When Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him to the face." And so great was the antagonism of Jewish narrowness at that time, that Paul says—"Before certain came from James, Cephas did eat with the Gentiles; but when they came he drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimu-

lation." Barnabas was stronger away from Peter than with him.

When Barnabas was deputed to go to Antioch, his large heart took in at once the blessedness of the work that he saw. Such a widening of the lines of faith and church work was after his own heart. "When he had seen the grace of God he was glad; and he exhorted them all that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord:" or, may be better as some ancient authorities put it, "That they would cleave unto the purpose of their heart in the Lord." By him the Church was confirmed in its new departure; and the mission of the Church to the Gentiles was made of no less moment than that "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Another man might have spoiled the believers' larger venture of faith and hope. But the crisis was as good as safely passed when Barnabas gave and the Church received his counsel. Henceforth, whatever Jerusalem might think or be, the light of the true faith and of a full obedience to the command of Christ shone brightly at Antioch. And Barnabas secured this safe passing of the critical time, and made a relapse almost impossible, by the singular wisdom of his decision concerning the guidance of the Church in Antioch. Apparently he thought that he himself was not the most fitted to lead that Church in its new departure, and to steer it through the broken water that must be ahead. With that lowly estimate of himself, which is one of his great marks, he stepped into the background, in order that a better and abler man, as he thought, might come to the front. But where could such a man be found? one whose native vigour and ability marked him as a leader of men? and whose culture, wisdom, and sagacious charity would find a genial air in the large-hearted Church at Antioch? Was there any one in the Church of that time, if not Barnabas, who could take the leader's place on that broader road, in that wider march which had only just been opened? Barnabas never for a moment seems to have thought of the Jerusalem Church, or of the apostles. For ignoring them he had only too much warrant. There was a man hiding,

it almost appears, in the city of his birth, to whom Barnabas' thought turned as by the inspiration of the Lord; and soon the Son of Exhortation was on his way to Tarsus to seek Saul and exhort him to a duty to Christ for which no one else was fit. To all seeming Saul was forgotten by the Church; and might be losing touch of the brotherhood. In reality he was in Tarsus a fugitive from the persecution of the Jews. He was being tried in the fire; being tempered for the wars of the Lord. Barnabas' visit and exhortation that Saul ought to go to Antioch and throw his vigour and zeal into the new life and wide enterprise there beginning, were like Farel's arrest of Calvin in Geneva, pointing him to an open door that none could shut, but that he, at peril, might refuse to enter. Happily, as with Calvin, Saul heard God's voice in his brother's, and returned with Barnabas to Antioch. There for a year he taught, as only he could teach, the fuller word of the life and love of God. The significance of his work, and the special character that Saul impressed on the Antioch Church, are evident in this—that the Gentiles there began to see that the brotherhood in Jesus was not a variety of Judaism, but something deeper, broader, and more loving; for it is said that "the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." Followers of The Christ was a nobler title than any association with Judaism could give: especially when it was not the Christ of the Jew, but of humanity, whom Saul preached and the Church adored.

In Saul's ministry at Antioch there is a coincidence that has had the most important meaning for Christianity. Can it be doubted that as certainly as he printed his character on that Church, so surely the special circumstances of the Church's origin, its peculiarly broad life and catholic zeal must have had a special influence over him; and must have exercised a great formative power on his yet early Christian life and work? Saul's life and ministry among the believers in Antioch must have largely qualified him for the mission work among the Gentiles, to which, with Barnabas, he was ordained by that Church. Not by the apostles, nor by the Jerusalem communion, but

by the church that was first opened to the Gentiles were Saul and Barnabas commissioned to the true work of the Church. Nothing could have been more opportune, stimulating, and educating for Saul than to be the leader for awhile of the broad-hearted believers in Antioch. And when, by evident signs from heaven and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the first formal mission to the Gentiles was undertaken by Saul and Barnabas, they being ordained thereto by the presbyters and teachers of Antioch, to whom "as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them"—then was finally made clear to all who would see, that the narrow ring of Jewish misconception of God was broken, and that the love of God was to all men as that of a father to his children. How slowly the churches in apostolic times came to receive this in its fulness is evident from Paul's life-long conflict with Judaizers and limiters of the love of God. But through and over all that weary strife Paul's clear, trumpet-like cry can ever be heard—"Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentile?" "There is one God and Father of all." It may be that the truth is not fully learned by some even yet. Even now the faith of some, if it be a true faith, lives in a ring narrow as that of the contracted hearts of old—the narrow-minded Jews who would have wrecked the Church as it began its voyage, even before it had cleared the harbour.

Let any one try to imagine what would have been the consequence to religion, and to the world at large, if the universal command of Jesus had been kept in abeyance by the confirmed or unremoved scruples of Peter and others; or by the dominance in the church of "those of the circumcision," especially at Jerusalem; or, to any extent, by the continuance of even the appearance of a metropolitan character in the Church that met under the shadow of the temple. As Paul said when writing of this very matter, Christ would have "died in vain." God would still have been misconceived. The brotherhood of man would have been less than a dream. The love of the Father revealed

in the Son as the atonement for the sins of all the earth-born prodigal children of God, would have been clouded or distorted into a degrading and repellent partiality. The world would have been left still seeking a God who might be worthy a sinner's love. But, that it is known that the love of God is wider than the best thoughts of the best men, and that His ways are not the Jew's ways, nor His thoughts the Jew's thoughts, but wider, deeper, higher, more blessed; and that this was wrought into the faith of Christendom, though not yet truly believed, is due to the lowly men, the unknown faithful, who at Antioch stepped out of the bounds of Jewish ignorance; and to Barnabas, who was so wise and loving in his judgment of their innovation; and to Paul, who, commissioned of God through them, took his place as the great leader of the larger hearts of the Church, and with his own heart constrained by the love of Christ, ever maintained that "in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." It was a great crisis through which Christ led His Church to truer thoughts of the Father and Himself. And when Jerusalem became only a memory, and the last symbols of the temple were carried to Rome as part of the plunder of a Roman victory—the church of Jerusalem being at the same time scattered—then the thoughts and feelings of the faithful could be more distinctly turned from local and limited judgment of God's purposes and ways, to Christ's own all-comprehending word as the sum of all needed belief—"God so loved the world that He gave His Only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life;" and to Christ's parting command, as the marching orders of the ransomed of the Lord—"Go ye and make disciples of all the nations."

G. BUCHANAN RYLEY.





## ON NUMBERING THE PEOPLE.

THE story of the world, it has been said, is the story of its cities. The greatest factor in the world's history has been religion. For many centuries the most powerful faiths of the world were associated with cities—Benares, Jerusalem, Rome, and Mecca. The world's history goes on much on the old lines, for its life crowds into cities, which become strong pulses from which all the rest of earth's humanity takes its tone, temperament, and character. But no city now-a-days gives form to any faith or becomes the symbol or expression of any creed. The attitude of our cities towards religions is mainly negative. The most powerful influences in London life to-day are not those which we call religious, but social and political. For some years there has been a feverish, not to say fearful, apprehension of this fact. Vague things have been felt and said in regard to the religious condition of the masses. This restlessness has more than once partly satisfied itself by confirming its fears in regard to London, by instituting a kind of census, first of places of worship, and then of the number of persons frequenting them. A good deal of disputation has resulted from these amateur countings of the people. The publication of figures, accompanied with certain inferences in regard to the comparative failure of the Churches to gather the people in, has been followed by literary reprisals and criticisms. This anxiety to look well on paper has been very evident in certain quarters; but it is so little, and has so many elements of feebleness in it, that it is beneath contempt. The opportunity to prove that London is irreligious, given over to a kind of revived paganism, and altogether just about hopeless, has been seized upon by certain melancholy persons with a readiness quite phenomenal. The miserable prophecies so frequently poured forth by gentlemen, of all sects, who are great at "conventions," now seem to have their fulfilment, and these modern Jeremiahs are indulging in the very enjoyable pleasure of a more than usual lugubrious lamentation. More "conventions," "conferences," and such-like are suggested, in

order that preachers may be taught their sins and intelligent Christians may learn how wicked it is to think. "London is lost!" is the cry of these Christian Cassandras. Millions! we are told, never go to church or chapel! *Ergo*, they are godless. Figures, concerning the habits of some people in the denser parts of the great city, are flung about with rhetorical vigour, and arguments based upon these platitudes of arithmetic are roared from the pulpit and the press with a passion worthy of more truth and charity. Now, living as the writer does in that part of the city which in general estimation, is the least given to attendance at church or chapel, it may be permitted to me to say a word, not in defence of the East End or of the poorer parts of London, but by way of correction of those libellers of us who mistake sects for God and creeds for Christ.

Christian men of average intelligence would be ashamed to make a physical image of God. It would not be blasphemous, for it would be too ridiculous to be associated with the greatest of sins. Yet they are not ashamed to apply arithmetical measurements to that which is of God, the Divine life in the world. Is it, in any sense, anything more than a relic of making images of God when men get their little books ready and set to work to number God's grace in human life and to apply the addition tables to the infinite love of God over the life and in the hearts of men? They do this in spite of sundry warnings in olden times. One somewhat timid and egotistical saint reckoned that the census of God's servants in Israel totalled up to the magnificent figure of ONE. It was the very natural blunder of a man overwrought with his own lot, and blind to the presence of God amongst the people. What a folly would have been a census at Calvary, on Mars Hill, or at Rome when Paul was left alone to face Cæsar! Nothing in all the manifold "inventions" of the human mind (more weak than wicked) can equal in feebleness the secret unbelief, allied with a blatant egotism, which frets itself into a numbering of the people. A census! Why who can compare a thousand nobodies with the one man—a Luther, a Bunyan, or a Wesley? Or who can truly tabulate one noble, heroic

life, brave, tender, and Christlike, shedding its benedictions upon all around it in some dark alley or dingy court, with the commonplace, formal church or chapel-going Christianity that idles away itself in some fashionable square at the West End?

But not only is the census-mongering a very foolish method of measuring the city of God, misleading as to the reality of the Christian life, and misinforming as to its prevalence, but the conclusions drawn from it are worse than the thing itself. Why, let me ask, was the inquiry so very particular as to the sect or church upon whose ministrations the people attend? We are told, with a painstaking division of all the creeds, and with an equally weak tabulation of this parish church and that Mr. So-and-so's chapel, how many people sat through services more or less interesting on a certain Sunday last year. The result is supposed to give us some accurate idea of the religious life of London. But is there not a fatal flaw in all this reasoning? Have there not been times in the history of God's true Church when the forsaking by the people of the "recognized" beliefs and the "authorized" services has been the first symptom of the awakening of the nation to a deeper sense of God? The rejection of official Christianity has always been the first sign of a truer acceptance of Christ.

Now let us look at the facts. For nearly two centuries and a half the ecclesiastical life of England has been without any deep or drastic change. Is not some such change almost overdue? Protestantism, but half-reformed Romanism; Puritanism, but half-confessed Evangelicalism, have possessed us as a people for many generations. The prayer-book of Edward VI. is still the manual of devotion and the intellectual expression of Episcopal belief. Trust-deeds of the seventeenth century still padlock many a pulpit amongst us. But side by side with this immobility of religious thought has come a revolution in political power, and a more wide-sweeping revolution in scientific thought. For many years these new forces only touched the higher intelligence of the nation; but to-day, through

press and school, they are saturating the mind of the people. With what result? To the rejection of God? No! To the denial of Christ? No! What then? To the forsaking by tens of thousands of Churches that fail to understand the people, or realize the changes that are passing over them. There are thousands of vicious persons in London and our great towns to whom all religions are hateful; but no one can know anything of the other sort who never or seldom come to our churches, but who are not vicious or irreligious, and not feel that they have not rejected God, but only Church systems and Church creeds. The theology taught by all the sects has silted down into the mind of the masses to a degree that few mere church and chapel goers realize. In many a common lodging-house questions are flung at the preacher that prove that the malignant theories of Priestism and the older Calvinism have lit up with their lurid light the imagination of men who half justify their wickedness by saying "they were never christened" or "they ain't one of the elect." Very strangely, but very really, this terrible caricature of God has remained impressed upon thousands of minds long after there has passed from them the memory of better days. On all hands it will be found that men, instead of feeling that they have "sinned," will mutter words which prove that they look up to God with a sullen face filled with the dark thought that "life is so hard and unjust." This undertone of our city life is swollen and deepened by the social conditions of modern society. They blame the well-to-do, the rich, and the powerful; but deeper than all, they blame that imaginary God whom they have heard preached by men who have put in the place of the gospel a creed as cruel in its theological dogmas as it has been hard in its social ethics. The French Revolution, with much that was horrible, was the revolt of the people against the priests and the peers.

Some of the readers of this paper may not like it to be said, but it is equally true, that in the same passionate half-blind reasoning, men in London and elsewhere are revolting against our Church systems, at whose doors they

lay the wrong-doing of our social life. By the census takers all this is complacently put down as Religious Indifference! But for my part, it seems to me that with thousands it is Religious Disappointment! They have passed through our Sunday Schools. They have learnt catechisms, prayers, and hymns, and they have come to the stern realities of daily life, and they have not found in our religion that which touches them, either as the healing of their sorrows, or the power of God in their hearts. Listening the other day to a noted Secularist lecturer this fact was evident. No one, so far as I could see, wanted to be without God. Nay, no one was without some awful and wondrous thought of Him whom they feel but do not know. But when the caricature of God set up by the two great schools of theology, the Calvinist and the Catholic (the only theology that has touched the popular mind), was exhibited with graphic power, they rose as in an agony, half anger and half ridicule, and howled it out of the place. Of that sort of thing no census can be taken, either for or against: but the fact stares us in the face. All down the ages of Christian history, the Churches, with their Pharisees, Priests, Prelates, Theologians and Creedalists, have always been the last to see God's ever dawning truth, and the first to cry "Crucify Him." The analogy does not fail even now. The vulgar methods of the Socialists, the more regulated and cultivated attack of the Secularists, the somewhat cynical unbelieving benevolences of the Agnostics, and the restlessness and discontent in our own Churches, are signs that the Christ is not within the walls of our theological citadel, nor within the veiled chambers of our Church systems. The wiser men amongst us are seeing this fact most plainly, and on all hands the walls of many of our Churches are breaking outwards into wider social habits and more truly Evangelical methods. But we are only at the beginning, and before the century is out there will have come that great spiritual revival—a truer faith and a higher life—which, I believe, will gather into its blessed and holy joys the tens of thousands who to-day seem without God and without hope in the world.

## THE RECENT ELECTIONS.

THE electoral victories which have revived the spirits of the Liberal party during the last few weeks have been so impressive by their repetition, and so striking in their results, that there is a possible danger of their producing an unwise elation of spirit which might interfere with that steady and resolute action which is essential if the success already achieved is to be consolidated and extended. The country, we are confidently told by some, has come back to Mr. Gladstone; but even if that were true—that is, if the party recovered the position it held in 1885—there would still be room for further expansion, which, in truth, must take place before any efficient measure of Home Rule can be secured. But while we should strongly deprecate a vain confidence, which might tempt to some rash steps (such as *The Pall Mall Gazette* is ever and anon suggesting) that would infallibly arrest the present movement, even if they did not provoke reaction, we should be the last to undervalue the extraordinary developments of popular feeling, as indicated by the recent elections. When Lord Beaconsfield held Liverpool (that is, simply held a seat always regarded as belonging to the party) and won Southwark, it was ostentatiously proclaimed that the country was with him, and he believed the flattering tale to his own defeat. There is nothing parallel to this in the present state of things. Glasgow is a Liberal seat, but even the victory was accentuated by the large increase of the Liberal vote, which was the best evidence that could be given of the utter feebleness of Liberal Unionism. Spalding, Coventry, Northwich, on the contrary, are distinct gains, and gains which are gathered from so wide an area, and constituencies so varied in their character, that it would be absurd to doubt that they indicate a very extensive change of feeling in the country. It may be that we have not yet got back to the high-water mark of 1880, but all the signs point to a renewal of that extraordinary outburst of Liberal enthusiasm.

The causes of this remarkable change are not very far

to seek. Mr. Chamberlain finds consolation in the idea that Mr. Gladstone has accepted the principles of Radical Unionism, and therefore the whole Liberal party is going after him. This being so, the question immediately suggests itself, Why does not Mr. Chamberlain himself go after him? But before we can decide whether there has been such a movement or not, it is necessary first to know what the principles of Radical Unionism really are, and that is precisely what we have never been able to consider. Apart from the Irish question, its principal aim seems to be to force Tories to do what they never meant to do, and what, but for the constraint put upon them, they certainly never would do. The difference between Lord Salisbury and other Ministers, such as Sir Robert Peel, who have been driven by force of circumstances to introduce measures which they had once opposed, is that Sir Robert Peel yielded only when convinced that he was wrong, whereas Lord Salisbury yields protesting that he is right, and that he would withhold all that he gives if only he dare. At the bidding of Radical Unionism he flings his principles to the winds, and Mr. Chamberlain invites the whole political world to come and rejoice over the loss. We cannot join in the congratulations, for the loss is not Lord Salisbury's, but that of the English nation. The country suffers by the degradation of its statesmen, and a statesman is degraded who, on his own confession, pursues a line of policy which at heart he disapproves in order that he may retain the favour of those to whom he owes his continuance in office.

This side of Radical Unionism certainly does not attract us. We never were profoundly interested in Mr. Jesse Collings and his Allotments, and we should not regard it as a very great gain if something in the shape of an Allotments Bill were wrung out of the present Ministry. In the Bill now before the House there was little when it was first introduced to justify the glowing welcome which it received from Mr. Jesse Collings, and if it assume a more efficient form before it is placed on the Statute Book, that will be due to the action of Liberals. We confess to a



weakness, which apparently Radical Unionism does not share, for having Liberal legislation in the hands of Liberal politicians who are in harmony with its principles and anxious for their honest application.

But the *raison d'être* of Radical Unionism is its Irish policy, and it is to this that Mr. Chamberlain refers when he says, "For my part I think the time is coming when it will be our duty to do something to define what those principles are, even to go into detail, and perhaps put before the country an alternative scheme for the settlement of these perplexing Irish questions, &c. In the meantime, until Mr. Gladstone clearly and plainly accepts our principles, until he shows that he is willing, generally, at all events, to adopt our application of them, to maintain with all the courage and firmness at our command, the attitude we took up two years ago," &c. It is surely rather hard upon Mr. Gladstone that he is to be forsaken for not accepting principles which, according to their principal exponent, require yet to be defined. With a strange inconsistency we are told, at one time, that the late elections have been won by supporters of Mr. Gladstone, because they have accepted Radical Unionist principles, and then immediately afterwards that till the principles have been worked out into a scheme, and till Mr. Gladstone has accepted both principles and details there can be no reconciliation. It is high time, at all events, that the scheme be produced; but there is one thing which it will certainly do, and that is it will break up the Unionist party.

It is only by reading between the lines of this, Mr. Chamberlain's latest manifesto, that we can understand its real significance. For that task we do not pretend to have any competence. But this we can see, that whatever has been obtained by the Radical Unionists was just as open to them twelve months ago. The alliance of Radicals with Tories, which was so painful a feature of the General Election, and has been exhibited in still more discreditable form since, has secured no concession which might not have been more easily obtained in the friendly conferences of a united Liberal party. This is what the electors have come to perceive. At first they were bewildered, and saw

men like trees walking, but they have come to have a clearer vision and have shaken themselves free from the terrors by which, for a time, they were haunted. Their wonder at present is how they should ever have been led to distrust the great leader whom they have so long been proud to follow. They are not less anxious for the unity of the Empire, but they are satisfied that there is no statesman in whose hands it is more safe than those of Mr. Gladstone.

The miserable failure of the Government—a failure more humiliating than that of any Administration of our time—has largely contributed to this result. A more complete demonstration of their incompetence their most bitter foes could not have desired. Some of them have made themselves conspicuous in this respect, but, with the exception of Mr. Ritchie, there is not one of them who has made a reputation which would render him one of the indispensables of a future Tory Ministry. Mr. Matthews was an experiment of which Lord Randolph Churchill is the reputed parent, and the Tory party have reason to regret that it ever was made. He has had two or three critical questions to deal with—questions which would have presented no difficulty to a Minister who knows how to respect others as well as to maintain his own dignity, but Mr. Matthews is a bully who, in the course of his Ministerial life, has given no sign either of true human feeling or of that practical knowledge which by its admirable tact may conceal the absence and supply the place of that nobler quality. An English Secretary of State, he exhibited the arrogance and smallness of some provincial magistrate dressed in a little brief authority. In many respects he was the most dangerous man in the Ministry. It is, to say the least, a strange coincidence—whether *post hoc* be also *propter hoc* we will not undertake to say—that during his *régime* we should have had such an outburst of judicial severity and policeman's insolence—from Mr. Justice Field's shameless sentence on the young Welsh girl, to Policeman Endacott's arrest of Miss Cass. Arrogance and oppressiveness has been in the air while Mr. Henry Matthews has been at the Home Office.

But even Mr. Matthews might have been endured had he been the only failure of the Administration. Unfortunately the redeeming features have been conspicuous by their absence. Instead of serving as a foil for the superior virtues of his colleagues, Mr. Matthews has rather been an extreme example of their characteristic faults. The idea of Mr. Balfour and Mr. Goschen seems to have been that the Government was meant to be a Government of repression, and their proceedings have been animated by this spirit. They, forsooth, are the champions of order, and while the first business is to maintain the Union, that only is part of their larger work of repressing lawlessness. It is to this that *The Times* has been hounding them on in articles which are a disgrace to the intelligence as well as to the patriotism of the writers. The insolence with which Mr. Balfour has habitually treated the Irish members is at once the result and the evidence of the spirit which has thus been fostered. Had the strength and firmness of that gentleman been equal to his haughty temper, the troubles of the Ministry would have been more numerous than they are. As it is, they are sufficiently grave. The majority in the House has not vanished, but it is very seriously diminished. We still hear occasional boast of the solid majority of one hundred, but it exists on paper or in platform rhetoric rather than in the division lists. If the Ministry are able to muster sixty for the crucial division now impending, they may congratulate themselves on their happy escape. But the decline in Parliament is trifling as compared with their decline in the country. The constituencies have noted their faults, and as opportunity offers are quietly passing judgment. They have not forgotten the pledges of July, 1886, that Ireland should be governed alike without Home Rule and without Coercion, and have refused to listen to the specious sophistry by which it was sought to prove that the Crimes Bill was not Coercion. They have seen the extraordinary vacillation of purpose which has made the Ministerial policy a mere game of battledore and shuttlecock, in which the Radical Unionists and the landlords have been the players. Mr.

Chamberlain spoke at Birmingham of the generosity of the Land Bill. How he did it with grave countenance puzzles us. There is not a touch of generosity in the whole procedure. The Bill assumed the most opposite characters according as the Ministry were under the influence of their Unionist friends in the Commons, or their landlord supporters in the House of Lords. In this policy of see-saw there has been neither strength, nor dignity, nor political shewdness. A Government which is to interpose any check on democracy must be made of sterner stuff, and, we venture to add, must place its force in the House of Commons under a different chief from Mr. W. H. Smith.

The brilliant victory of Sir George Trevelyan at Glasgow, though not the first, was the most striking evidence which had hitherto been afforded of the remarkable change which is going on in public opinion. The candidature itself was a sufficiently striking incident, but it has been so strongly emphasized by the result that there is some danger lest its real significance should be overlooked. That the distinguished Radical, who but twelve months ago risked and lost his seat because of his dissent from Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bills, should have accepted the invitation of the electors of Bridgeton to contest the seat as a supporter of Mr. Gladstone, was itself sufficiently remarkable. Every possible art was employed to throw dust into the eyes of the constituency, and of the country at large, as to the meaning of a fact which was extremely unwelcome, but which, like facts in general, has proved very obstinate and intractable. Sir George, who was lately the subject of most glowing eulogy, was for the time the best reviled man in the Liberal party, with the exception only of Mr. Gladstone. He was denounced in good round terms as a traitor and a renegade. On the showing of his calumniators themselves, he would in such case have been one of the most idiotic of politicians, since he has returned to a party which they are never weary of representing as in the last stage of political decadence. They are not, however, particularly careful as to logical consistency. What they had to do was to produce

an impression unfavourable to Sir George Trevelyan, and all that they could say was that he was a deserter from their ranks. We are not surprised at their anger, for Sir George's secession exposes the true animus of the conspiracy against Mr. Gladstone by showing that a true Liberal could not remain a party to it. Of all the Unionist leaders Sir George had most reason to complain of the action of his former chief. If there was one among them whose reluctance to accede to the demands of the Irish party might be excused, it was the man who, as Chief Secretary, had borne the taunts and insults of the Home Rule members from 1882 to 1884; but Mr. Gladstone felt so strongly that Home Rule was the question of the hour that he thought it necessary to make the celebrated speech at Hawick, which contributed largely to the defeat of his former colleague. It was one of the regrettable incidents of an unfortunate campaign, though, be it remembered, it was in no respect parallel to the action taken by Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain in supporting Tory candidates. Sir George Trevelyan and Mr. Brown were agreed on every point except Home Rule; and all that Mr. Gladstone advised was that the electors should vote for the candidate who supported his policy on that point, rather than for one who opposed it. It would not have been surprising, however, if Sir George had resented the interference; as he certainly would have done had he been less magnanimous—more sensitive to his own personal position, and less possessed with a faith in true Liberalism. But, from the beginning, he has been contending only for what he esteemed a wise and righteous measure; and as events have made it apparent that his associates had other aims in view, and were prepared to sacrifice the Liberal party to their personal fads or ambitions, he thought it necessary to leave them. Mr. Arthur Elliott (a member of a class which certainly has not served Liberalism for nought) exults in the production of proof that Sir George never was a "Unionist." He is undoubtedly right. Of his patriotic devotion to the Union Sir George gave abundant proof at the time when he

accepted the office of Chief Secretary in the darkest hour of the Irish crisis, and in the years of anxious toil and even peril which followed. But he knew Ireland too well to believe in a policy of coercion; and had there been no other cause, the introduction of the Crimes' Act was sufficient to teach him, as it ought to have taught every true Liberal, that he could no longer remain in the ranks of the misnamed Unionists. The serious aspect of the change of position is, that he is a type of a large class of Liberal electors. No clearer evidence of this need be desired than that supplied by the figures of the election. Mr. Ashley polled fewer votes than the Tory candidate of 1885, whereas Sir George's was the highest poll by some hundreds which any candidate has yet secured. Yet Glasgow is supposed to be a hotbed of Unionism. Mr. Chamberlain and his *fidus Achates*, paid it a visit recently, and there was a great blowing of trumpets over the effect which had been produced. The prophecies of Mr. Jesse Collings sound very ludicrous now.

Regretting, as we do, the absence of Mr. E. R. Russell from Parliament, and consequently the need for a contest at all, we cannot but rejoice that it came in the very nick of time and under circumstances of so much significance. Sir George Trevelyan's return to the Liberal party is an event of even more importance than his return to the House of Commons. Its importance was increased by the way in which the election was conducted. Mr. Evelyn Ashley can hardly console himself in the hour of defeat with the proud reflection of Francis I. on the morrow of his great disaster. He not only lost—that was inevitable—but he lost after degrading a political contest into a personal wrangle. It is not a matter of great astonishment that he should be on the side of the "Unionists," for he is an Irish landlord, and, although a far-seeing sagacity might have led him to trust to the more generous policy of Mr. Gladstone, yet he is not to be severely condemned for sharing the prejudices of his class. Having ourselves a very lively recollection of the feeling displayed by his honoured father in reference to the use by Mr. Price

Hughes of Mr. Chamberlain's well-known words as to those who "toil not, neither do they spin," it was a little amusing to find Mr. Evelyn Ashley appearing as the advocate and champion of the member for West Birmingham. But times are changed, and it is only fair to say that the change has not been in Mr. Ashley. The controversy itself was an unhappy one, and it was not improved by the interposition of the "Unionist" leaders. As usual, Lord Hartington, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Bright sent letters, and, as usual, the result showed that in this matter of political guidance nobody cares for them or their letters. A few more such experiences ought to enlighten even themselves as to the extent to which they have lost influence over the Liberal party. With very few exceptions the men who follow them are Tories at heart. There are sound Liberals who hope against hope, some for the return of Lord Hartington, others for that of Mr. Chamberlain, but those who follow them are for the most part of the class which the Liberal party is always throwing off at each successive advance, and have, in fact, been waiting for a decent pretext to sever their old relations. Any influence which these gentlemen ever had over the rank and file is rapidly passing away, and this, which is the most obvious, was also the true reason of the great majority which Sir George Trevelyan secured. The people refused to believe in the shameless attacks upon a statesman who throughout life has followed the guiding star of principle and duty, and whose only fault was that, unlike the men who were lauding him yesterday and are assailing him to-day, he trusts Mr. Gladstone more than a party whose overtures to Mr. Parnell in 1885 did much to create the present difficulty, and whose recent action on the Land Bill suggests the thought that if it seemed politic to repeat the intrigues of that period, there would be no principle to restrain such action.

The victory at Northwich could not eclipse that of Glasgow, but it came as a greater surprise. In one point it is peculiarly satisfactory, as it may serve to enlighten great territorial Whigs as to the limits of their power.



There was something singularly mean in the endeavour of the Tory papers to fix the responsibility of defeat upon the Duke of Westminster and his unpopularity. The Duke's conduct in selling the portrait of the great statesman to whom he owed his dukedom, simply because of differences in political opinion, has done much to destroy the respect which many would have desired to retain for him despite their absolute loss of political confidence. Still, even those who have been most painfully impressed by his recent proceedings would be the first to condemn the meanness which sought to make him the scapegoat for a great Tory disaster. For that was what the election really was. The electors identified Unionism with Toryism, and as they hated Toryism they rejected its representative. This is the kind of awakening which is going on all over the country. It was more complete in Cheshire than had been generally expected, but all who knew the constituency anticipated a Liberal victory—they were surprised only by its overwhelming character. The lesson to be drawn from it is—wait on, and above all work on. Northwich and Glasgow have done much towards breaking up the Liberal Unionist party, and the days of the confederacy in which it was so important an element are numbered.



## EDITORIAL NOTES.

It is desirable that Dissenters should clearly understand the views of a large section of the clergy in relation to themselves. We, therefore, give the following comments on Archdeacon Farrar's speech at Cheshunt College, contained in a letter to the *Guardian* :—

SIR,—We shall all agree with Archdeacon Farrar that the test of a true Christian is in the bringing forth of the fruits of the Spirit. Let us see about his own fruits as exhibited in his speech at Cheshunt.

Here I find that persons who say that the various Nonconformist bodies do not belong to the great Church of Christ are guilty of a gross and uncharitable falsehood. I also find in the clergy lists that Arch-

deacon Farrar is Canon of Westminster (income £1,000), rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster (income £400), and Archdeacon of Westminster. How then about the Church which gives Archdeacon Farrar income and position? Your readers may learn what the Church says on the above subject by simply consulting the canons of A.D. 1603, numbers 2 to 12. One canon, No. 11, is painfully explicit; the words are familiar and need not be quoted. It may be a fruit of the Spirit to accept income and position, and then deliberately to slander the institution which practically gives them to you, but we may have our own opinion what kind of spirit it is which brings forth such a fruit.

This harangue meant for Westminster appears to have been received with cheers at Cheshunt. I wonder why. Perhaps they were glad to see an Archdeacon making an exhibition of himself. They could not have believed the statement made, inasmuch as the older Nonconformist bodies do not claim to be Churches strictly so called, or to have any membership in the Church visible; in the Church invisible no such *body* could have membership. If there is such a thing as a visible Church having definite rules and laws, it must follow that every body of Christians cannot have membership in it. It is the contention of the Nonconformist bodies that there is no such thing as a visible Church.

If my voice could reach to Cheshunt, I should like to ask the gentlemen present at the luncheon why they cheered. Why are they at Cheshunt? Is it because they do not think that they have attainments enough to get on in the "Establishment," or because conscience forbids them to eat the bread of the Church and then to smite it on the face? There are Nonconformists who, with every opportunity for a successful career in the Church, have for conscience' sake deliberately abstained from entering it. What conceivable fellowship can they have with the Conformists who take pains to explain to all men that their Church is a gross and uncharitable —?

JOHN MITCHELL.

This gentleman, we suppose, is the parish priest of Minsterley. Of his law we say nothing. It is probably correct, and the more correct it is the more serious the grievance of which Nonconformists have to complain. If we are thus branded as schismatics and heretics, it is the law by which the Church with these enactments is established that thus brands us. There is no escape from this. All the courteous acts and Christian deeds of individual men cannot get rid of the fact that this stigma is fixed upon us by public authority. The tone of Mr. Mitchell is unpleasant, one might be disposed to call it insolent, were it not that the spirit which it breathes has become so natural to the class

of whose views this gentleman is an exponent, that they do not understand how arrogant and insolent they are. But we are justified in complaining of the State which gives these gentlemen exclusive rights as the teachers of the national faith, and which, in fact, so separates and distinguishes them from all others that the exclusive temper which they display is really the natural and almost necessary result of the position which the State has given them. No doubt their sacerdotal theory would remain even if their special privileges were lost, but that would concern only themselves and those who follow them. We are not affected by the pretensions of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and still less should we be disturbed by those of an Anglican clergy who can find no one outside the limits of their own Church to admit their claims, if these had not on them the imprimatur of the State. When Mr. Mitchell tells us that we do not even claim or desire to be of the visible Church, we can only smile and ask what manner of spirit can he be of who can thus narrow the idea of the Church of Christ. But when the State so far sanctions this arrogance that it treats us all as heretics, with whom the clergy of the true Church must not even exchange the ordinary courtesies of Christian fellowship, we feel that this alone justifies us in demanding that so iniquitous a system should come to an end. If these clergy can persuade the world that they alone are ministers of Jesus Christ by all means let them do so. It will be a very melancholy conclusion that will be reached if conviction is forced on us that all the pure devotion, the sanctified talent, the true spiritual heroism, by which the kingdom of Christ has been extended in the world, has no lot or part in the true Church unless it has conformed to the Episcopal idea and accepted the authority of bishops and priests. Let any one try to realise what this means, and he must indeed be firmly wedded to his theory if he can adhere to it with the consequences it entails. In such a case it is not the excommunicated who would need pity, but those who can rejoice in their "little garden, walled around." What we object to, however, is that the State should help to build and repair the walls.

On the showing of Dr. Jessopp in one of his genial articles on the "Trials of a Country Parson" in the August number of *The Nineteenth Century* the younger generations of these clerical worthies show no disposition to diminish their claims or to abate one iota of their proud prerogative. "Of late years the rising generation of clerics has begun to insist more and more upon the necessity of this professional exclusiveness, and desires to claim for itself the privileges of a caste." "We must close up our ranks" (said one of them to me), "close up our ranks and present a united front, and show the world that we are prepared to hang together, act together, march together. We have been atoms too long; we want coherence, my dear sir, coherence. We are moving towards the general adoption of the Catholic hassock." Now, to use Dr. Jessopp's own phrase, "if a man chooses to be his own tailor, nobody will be much the worse, and nobody will much care." But the dress represents a clerical temper—arrogant, exclusive, functional—of all others that which the minister of Christ should not cherish. It would be very unfair, however, to blame these young country clerics for the exhibition of a spirit as much out of harmony with the spirit of our modern society as with the genius and teachings of the Master and His gospel. They have simply caught the tone and feeling of the leaders in Convocations and Church Congresses, and they have caught it to their own destruction. From us as Nonconformists these growing manifestations of clerical arrogance demand more consideration than they have received. They impose on us the necessity of insisting that we can have spiritual fellowship with those only who recognize our ministers and churches as ministers and churches of Christ. What is more, ministers will have to teach their people so, and to teach it very strongly, if they are to be faithful to the great interests committed to their care.

---

Mr. Bright's introduction in his speech at Greenwich of the story of the Spaniard who gave much table-cloth but little food to his guests, and its application to Mr. Gladstone,

was an offence against good taste and right feelings which I would rather not describe in the terms which it deserves. Political controversy is not raised in character by the use of such weapons. Mr. Bright should not forget the old maxim, *noblesse oblige*. He has been regarded as a Christian politician, and we are entitled to look to him for an example of magnanimity and courtesy, especially when dealing with an old friend, which we do not find in Mr. Gladstone's Tory or even Unionist assailants. Apart from his attack on Mr. Gladstone, however, the speech afforded a curious illustration of the change which has passed over the speaker. Mr. Bright, as the defender of a Tory Government, is a sufficiently curious spectacle, but the manner in which he plays his new part is even more extraordinary. There is a strange affectation in his allusion to the recent elections, which is singularly unlike the plain, straightforward statement we expect from him. "I see it stated in the papers that two or three seats have been won," &c. The style of this is ludicrous; the matter disingenuous. Mr. Bright knows what even the most partisan journal, including *The Times*, are compelled to acknowledge, that there is a manifest current of opinion against the Government. It was seen in the East at Spalding, in the Midlands at Coventry, in the most Tory districts of the country, in the reduced majorities of Basingstoke and Brixton, and in Scotland in the extraordinary triumph at Glasgow, supposed to be the centre of Unionism in the country. From every side the same story of Liberal revival and Liberal reunion comes. But it has not touched the City of London, and Mr. Bright of all men points to that with satisfaction. It is no answer to the facts on the opposite side, for no one supposes that the warm sun of Liberalism has melted or even began to melt that glacier of selfishness, reaction, and bigotry which constitutes the political life of the City. The City and the constituencies which it influences will be the last region to be affected by the forces making for justice and reform. But it is remarkable that Mr. Bright should look to them with any complacency. They are opposed to Mr. Gladstone, but they are just as much opposed to Mr. Bright

when he is his true self. They are opposing Home Rule to-day just as they supported Jingoism ten years ago, and just as they would resist any reforms in Church or State that might be proposed to-morrow. Mr. John Morley says that London is the key of the situation, and that therefore London constituencies must be educated. We agree in the practical conclusion, but the statement on which it rests needs qualification. There is much that may be done in London. By wise and persevering effort the representation may be materially changed. But the spirit which dominates the City is not a spirit to be educated or conciliated, but to be conquered. The spirit of society, of the Stock Exchange, of the West End clubs, of the aristocracy and their dependents, and of villadom, with its timid fears and its small ambitions, is hostile to progress and has to be overcome. It is surely enough to sadden any one, standing outside political circles, and happily as ignorant of their intrigues as free from their wretched personalities, to find Mr. Bright regarding with satisfaction the strength of forces which have resisted all the great movements to which his life has been given, and the praises of whose representatives ought to be resented by him as the worst of insults. One thing is certain. They would not praise him did they believe him still faithful to the great principles of Liberalism.

---

#### CURRENT LITERATURE.

*The Gospel in South India; or, the Religious Life, Experience, and Character of the Hindu Christians.* By the Rev. SAMUEL MATEER, F.L.S. (Religious Tract Society.) This is an account of the triumphs that have been won by the gospel in South India. It is a plain, unvarnished statement of facts, well authenticated and easily verifiable, relating the Christian conduct and experience of those who have been converted from heathenism to Christianity in Travancore. Mr. Mateer is a well-known missionary of intense devotion and proud experience, and this book is a deeply affecting summary of the practical results of Christian teaching and preaching by the writer as seen in the lives of the people amongst whom he has lived and laboured, and it is well fitted to encourage and stimulate the

friends of the missionary cause at home. It is especially useful on account of the clear and decided testimony which it bears to "the infinite superiority of the gospel over all false religion, not only in its direct spiritual result, of subduing rebels to God, regenerating the soul and setting the heart right, but in furthering education, civilization, refinement, and true morality; teaching each class its respective duties, healing by the gospel of love the caste hatreds, the vile superstitions, the vast moral evils that prevail in India, and welding opposing classes of the population ultimately into one nation, one brotherhood, animated by faith in the true God—the Father of all—and by love to one another. This record of the success already achieved in one department of the Indian mission fields is calculated to inspire the brightest hopes with regard to the future of Christianity in the whole of the vast empire.

*The Words of the Angels.* By RUDOLF STIER, D.D. With a Preface by J. C. RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool. (Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey, and Co.) This is a new edition of a volume by the well-known author of the "Words of the Lord Jesus." It will be heartily welcomed by many English Christians, and especially by preachers and theological students, and is thoroughly worthy to take its place side by side with Dr. Stier's great work. To those who are familiar with his "Words of the Lord Jesus," it will be unnecessary to say anything in the way of recommendation of this new volume. Suffice it to say, that it is marked by all the characteristic excellences of the writer, and throws fresh light on many familiar passages in the Bible.

*Radna; or the Great Conspiracy of 1881.* By PRINCESS OLGA (Chatto and Windus.) This is a story of Russian life intended to illustrate the internal difficulties both of the Russian Government and of its enemies, and, strange to say, to awaken our sympathies at the same time for the Tsar on the one hand and for the Nihilists upon the other. Both alike are the victims of that terrible bureaucracy which appears to unite in itself the worst evils of all possible kinds of despotism. It is arbitrary, and yet without any of those restraints which will sometimes put a check upon the most absolute of despots. It works in secret, and instead of being responsible for its actions so manages its procedure as to stand between the oppressed subjects and the Tsar in whose name it works, and who is naturally held responsible for the wrongs it inflicts, the crimes it perpetrates, and the misery it scatters wherever its cupidity or passion finds a fitting victim. The Princess Olga thoroughly understands its working, and to those who are at all familiar with her style of writing, it is superfluous to say that she treats her subject in such a way as to enchain the attention of the reader from beginning to end of the story, which is in fact a dramatic presentation of facts that is of infinite importance that Englishmen should properly



understand. The story introduces us to great variety of scenes. It opens in a Polish castle, in a weirdlike and desolate region, whose people, however, are under the ever-watchful surveillance of the tyrannical bureaucrats of St. Petersburg; and in the exceedingly vivid and striking scenes which are here portrayed, we get some idea of the evil which is wrought by men who abuse the name of their sovereign for deeds as mean as they are perfidious and cruel. We are then taken to St. Petersburg, and introduced both to the palace and the home of the conspirators. We see the hidden working of their intrigue in the palace, and of the Nihilist plotters in the obscure haunts where they encourage each other in their hatred of the government, and plan their nefarious schemes for the destruction of the innocent. Altogether we get a very complete conception of the inner working of the system whose strange developments from time to time startle and disturb the peace of Europe. It is a book well worth reading, and we rise from its perusal with a feeling of commiseration for the unhappy monarch supposed to be absolute, but in reality the victim of a hideous system from which the way of escape does not seem to be easy.

*Catechism of the Second Reformation.* By ALEXANDER F. MITCHELL, D.D. (J. Nisbet and Co.) This book contains an account of the composition and sources of the Catechism of the Westminster Assembly. It is divided into two parts. The first part is devoted to the Shorter Catechism, every answer in which is compared with answers given in previous catechetical manuals used in the Puritan Churches. The second part is taken up with two Scottish Catechisms, one by Rutherford and the other by Wyllis. The book is interesting, as showing the changes in theological opinion which led to corresponding changes in the Catechism. The value of the treatise is enhanced by the biographical notices of the authors of the several catechisms included in it, and also by the historical introduction.

*Henry Ward Beecher in England.* Henry Ward Beecher's Last Sermons. (James Clarke and Co.) In these two volumes we have the sermons preached by Mr. Beecher in the closing year of his ministry. They have therefore a singularly tender and pathetic interest. We do not propose to discuss here the soundness of Mr. Beecher's teaching. On that point opinions may differ, but even those who most seriously dissent from his theology may yet be thankful to have an accurate report of these very remarkable discourses. We meet, on the one hand, those who talk as though all his ideas were to be received as true because of the exquisite form in which they are presented; while, on the other hand, are those who would deny even the beauty of the form because they regard the teaching as dangerous. We differ from both. Because we feel the fascination of his genius, we are not prepared to accept him as infallible; but though we claim our liberty to dissent from the teaching, when we think dissent necessary, we are

not therefore insensible to the marvellous power of the teacher. Those who feel like us will gladly welcome this record of a memorable visit, and of the still more memorable season by which it was succeeded. We pity the man, whatever his theology, who cannot find in these volumes suggestion and inspiration. No pains have been spared to make the reports accurate and complete, and these qualities are sufficient to give them value.

*Only a Curate.* By E. G. EGOMET. (T. F. UNWIN.) We have at various times had a considerable number of books professing to photograph the inner life of Congregational churches, and especially to set forth the grievances under which their ministers suffer, and by stress of which the heroes of these stories are often driven into the quiet and peace of the Establishment, as we suppose to live happily all the rest of their days. The book before us may help to show how far it is probable that this *pleasant* picture will be realized. The author writes in the character of a clergyman, and there is no reason why he may not himself belong to the favoured class. At all events, he is evidently a man who has a somewhat extended knowledge of the inner working of the Anglican Church, especially in rural districts. He is evidently a strong Churchman, who regards Dissent as a great evil, for which the neglect of the Church is wholly, if not entirely, responsible. He clearly believes that the happiest thing for the nation would be for the clergyman to be the one religious teacher in the parish; and everything that interferes with this is regarded by him as an evil. Either his acquaintance with things outside the Church is not very accurate, or his views are coloured by his associations. He has the ordinary prejudice against Board Schools. Speaking of one of the parishes, he introduces a Methodist who says, "We have a Board School now, and the managers say there is no time to spare from other studies for reading the Bible, so I have established a Sunday class in the chapel." Considering that before this was done, the children were not taught at all except in an old dame's school for a few months, while, as to religious instruction, "sometimes twice or thrice a year" the parson, who lived ten miles off, would get the children to Church, would make them repeat their catechism, of which they knew little, cared for less, and did not understand at all, we do not see that they would have been much the worse even if the Board School had been managed on the extreme secularist lines. But we should be glad to know where the rural School Boards are which forbid the reading of the Bible. We do not doubt that there may be some, but the idea which seems to prevail among a certain class of churchmen that this is the case with Board Schools generally is an absolute mistake. This feeling about Board Schools is itself sufficient to indicate the strong proclivities of the writer of which indeed there is abundant evidence scattered all over the book. Despite the evils of the system which he represents, he says that Disestablishment would be a great misfortune,

and Disendowment a great fraud. On this subject, he writes with a confidence which is in exact ratio to his ignorance of the facts. "Disendowment would be a downright robbery. The lands and glebes and other emoluments were given, not by the State, but by private individuals. If a person made me a gift, or left me a legacy, say of one hundred pounds, no person could have a right to deprive either myself or my heirs of the possession of it. What is just towards the individual is equally so to the corporate body. The State, whether in land or tithes, gave nothing to the Church, and is bound to protect the Church body as much as the private individual in the enjoyment of its revenues." Of course every separate proposition in this statement would be denied, not only by Nonconformists, but by many of the most competent jurists and statesmen in the country. Outside the circle of the clergy and professional Church defenders, there are comparatively few intelligent men who have examined the subject at all, who accept the idea that the Church is in the enjoyment of private property. The writer's views on this question lend all the more weight to his evidence on the internal condition of the Church. We commend his book, not because of any literary power which it possesses, for there is a great lack of art in the story itself, but simply because it is the evidence of a witness, friendly to the Establishment, as to the absolute failure of the system in the very districts for the sake of which we are urged to retain it. A more melancholy picture than is here given of the evils of patronage, of the inefficiency of numbers of the clergy, and of the wretched condition, both of the churches and the people, has not often been presented.

*Moses: His Life and Times.* By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. (J. Nisbet and Co.) Mr. Rawlinson has a great subject, and it is one with which he is peculiarly fitted to deal. He has studied the country, the times, the people, as well as the noble hero himself. The outlines of the career of the great Lawgiver are made to stand before us clear and distinct as they are sketched in the Bible, and these are quite sufficient to enable us to form an impartial estimate of his character. Its most prominent features are pointed out by Mr. Rawlinson in his closing chapter, where he dwells upon the high qualities of faithfulness, meekness, unselfishness, and trust in God, by which he was chiefly distinguished, and by which he has earned a renown such as belong to few others in the long roll of Bible heroes. The book may be described as an old jewel in a new setting.

A considerable number of small books from J. F. Shaw and Co. have for some time been waiting notice.—*In all Time of our Tribulation.* The Story of Piers Gavestone. By EMILY SARAH HOLT. This is another of those beautiful historical tales with which Miss Holt is wont from time to time to charm as well as to instruct her readers. The story is primarily intended we suppose

for young people; but it is one which older people too may read with pleasure and also with profit. Miss Holt aims at something more than a bare narration of historical events. In the book before us she carries us back to a period far removed from the present, even to the days of Edward II., and tells over again the story of Piers Gavestone, who, if not the hero, is certainly the principal person of the story. Miss Holt always shows great skill in the delineation of character, and she draws that of Gavestone with much tenderness, and yet at the same time with great fidelity and discrimination. Her view of him does not differ materially, if at all, from that which readers of history have been accustomed to hold concerning him, viz., that he was weak rather than wicked, and was at least as much sinned against as sinning.—*Through Unknown Ways; or, the Journal Books of Dorothea Trundel*. By L. E. GUERNSEY. In the form of leaves of history have kept by a lady of the period, Miss Guernsey has here given us a picture of the social and domestic life of the court and the aristocracy in the times of Charles II. and James II. For the characters are mainly taken from the higher grades of society. Dorothea Trundel, the heroine, is a young lady who passes through unknown ways from a position of obscurity and comparative poverty to one of affluence and renown as the wife of Sir Robert Studley.—*Our Soldier Hero*, by M. L. RIDLEY, is pervaded by a religious spirit, and is fitted to exert a happy influence on boys for whom it is chiefly intended. Leslie, the hero, is a boy of naturally sweet and gentle disposition, who at an early age conceives a strong desire to be a soldier. On the death of his father, however, owing to a loss in business which broke his heart, Leslie sacrificed his ambition in this respect, in order that he might remain with his widowed mother, thus proving himself a true hero and a good soldier of Jesus Christ. His self-sacrifice was unexpectedly rewarded by the return of a rich bachelor uncle, who sent him to college, and thus enabled him to realize the cherished wish of his early childhood. We do not think that it contributes to the real value or the sound teaching of such a story that the self-sacrifice should, as in the case before us, be rewarded by worldly prosperity.—*His Guardian Angel*, by Miss BRENDA, is a temperance story, showing the restraining and restoring influence which a devoted sister exerted over a dissolute brother, whose unsteadiness and love of conviviality frequently brought him into trouble. One very important way in which she helped him was by signing the pledge—her personal example doing much to enforce her teaching and exhortations on the subject of temperance.—*To-morrow*, by Mrs. STANLEY LEATHES, is designed to illustrate the evil of procrastination. Norah Cameron, the heroine, on leaving school is sent for by her father to join him at his own home, but having a strong aversion to doing so on account of the reserve which had sprung up between them owing to long absence from each other, she puts off doing so till to-morrow, going to the house of a schoolfellow instead. When to-morrow comes Norah

receives a letter from her father to say that he has gone abroad. The moral of the tale is, do not defer till to-morrow the duty of to-day.—*Jonas Hoggerley*, by J. JACKSON WRAY, furnishes us with a vivid and striking illustration of the old proverbs that "the sowing of wrong brings a harvest of thorns," and that "though worth may be blamed it can never be shamed." The character of Jonas, the purse-proud, avaricious, and vindictive squire, is powerfully drawn, and the plot by which his nefarious schemes were defeated, and the victims of his cruelty and wrong-doing were delivered from the danger which threatened them, is both cleverly conceived and carefully worked out. *Not so very long ago*, by the Author of "At All Times," records the ups and downs, the joys and the sorrows, of a family of young children. The story has a good deal of freshness and naturalness in it, and is pretty sure to be relished by those for whom it is intended.—*Climbing Higher* is a circus story. The spirit of the story is admirable, but the plot is, to say the least, improbable, and the ending is sad. Why should the good children in these stories so often be made to die in their childhood?—*Madge Hardwick; or, The Mists of the Valley*, by AGNES GIBERNE, is designed to illustrate the struggles of a soul enveloped in the mists of religious doubt and uncertainty. Madge Hardwick, with her firm faith, her strong, practical common-sense, and her warm and kindly sympathy, is the heroine of the story, and forms an admirable foil to the sceptical doctor; but the main interest centres in Nannie, the doctor's niece, whose mind is disturbed and distressed by all kinds of questionings and disputings. How she fought with her doubts and conquered them is well told.—*Fairy Phæbe; or, Facing the Footlights*, by L. TAYLOR, gives us a sad picture of the cruel sufferings endured by the little children who take part in the pantomimes and acrobatic performances of theatres, and who are thus made to cater for the amusement of the public. We have also received from the same house a number of smaller story-books, all of which we can heartily recommend. We have space only to mention their names. They are as follows. *We Wives; or, All Hallowe'en*. By LINA ORMER COOPER.—*Slave-girl of Pompeii*. A Tale of the First Century. By EMILY SARAH HOLT.—*One of those Little Ones*. By MRS. FALNER BRACKENBURY.—*Jitana's Story*. By LOUISE MARSTON.—*How Hettie Caught the Sunbeams*. By GERTRUDE P. DYER.—*Those Two*. By EMILY DIBDIN.—*Our Winnie; or, When the Swallows Go*. By EVELYN EVERETT-GREEN.—*Dickie's Attic*. By CATHERINE SHAW.—*Maggie's Mistake; or, Bright Light in the Cloud*. By MRS. LUCAS-SHADWELL.—*The Witch of the Rocks*. By M. E. WINCHES-TER.—*Young Ishmael Conway*. By E. A. B. D.

*The History of England for Beginners*. By ARABELLA B. BUCKLEY. (Macmillan and Co.) The general object of this book is sufficiently defined in the title. It is intended to serve as an introduction to the study of English history. The special aim of the writer has been

"to present a vivid picture of the life, the difficulties, and the achievements of our ancestors; showing how our laws, our constitution, our trades, and colonies have arisen." Primers of any subject are apt to be somewhat dry and uninviting, but Miss Buckley, while of necessity presenting little more than the barest outlines of her subject, has managed to invest them with a warm and living human interest. Her work is well fitted to pave the way for a more thorough and systematic study of the subject in more comprehensive histories. The coloured maps and chronological and genealogical tables are a very important adjunct of a work like this, and serve considerably to enhance its value for educational purposes.

*William Tyndale's Vow; or, The True Story of a Great Life.* Written for Young People. By FRANCES E. COOKE. (Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey, and Co.) The story of William Tyndale is eminently suited to inspire the young with high resolves and noble purposes. It is told by Miss Cooke in a clear, simple, and interesting style. The book is sure to charm as well as to instruct.

*Present-Day Tracts.* Vol. III. (Religious Tract Society.) The new volume of this excellent series includes valuable contributions from four new writers. Mr. Stevenson writes on "The Claims of Christ on the Conscience"; Dr. Stoughton deals with the "Doctrine of the Atonement Historically and Scripturally Examined"; Mr. McCheyne Edgar treats of "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ"; Dr. Reynolds discusses the subject of "Buddhism, a Comparison and a Contrast between Buddhism and Christianity." We have also papers by Mr. Radford Thomson on "Auguste Comte and the Religion of Humanity," and by Mr. Iverach on "The Ethics of Evolution."

*Joseph, the Prime Minister.* By W. M. TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D. (Hamilton, Adams, and Co.) As Dr. Taylor very fitly observes, the story of Joseph is one of the first favourites of our childhood. It has an interest for people of all ages, but it has a special charm for the young, and more particularly for young men. Dr. Taylor has here given us the old jewel in a new setting. A rare skill in drawing out the lessons of the narrative, combined with an easy flowing style, make this book very pleasant as well as profitable reading, and will ensure for it, as they have ensured for its predecessors, a hearty reception and a wide circulation amongst readers on this side the water.

*The King's Coin; or, God's Fraction.* By Rev. T. J. BASS. (J. Nisbet and Co.) This is an earnest endeavour to impress upon Christian people the oft forgotten and much neglected duty of setting apart a fixed proportion of their income to the service of God. The writer gives some clear and much needed Scriptural teaching on the subject of systematic giving.

*How to Study the English Bible.* By R. B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A. (Religious Tract Society.) "This little book (says Mr. Girdlestone) is intended to supply a need felt by many students of God's Word, viz., some practical guidance which may enable them to make the best of God's Word;" and we need hardly add that it is well adapted to its purpose. There are many lovers of the Bible who will be thankful for the valuable help to the understanding of the Scriptures which which is contained in the pages of this useful and unpretentious little work.

*Solomon: His Life and Times.* By Rev. F. W. FARRAR, L.D., F.R.S. (J. Nisbet and Co.) This is an exceedingly clear and comprehensive account of the life and times of Solomon. Dr. Farrar has carefully studied his subject, and has brought together a vast collection of facts and quotations for its elucidation and illustration, and in this way he has succeeded in pouring fresh light on one of the most prominent, but also perhaps one of the least known, of Scripture characters. Solomon has been, to a large extent, passed over by writers of Biblical biographies. The reason of the neglect no doubt is to be found in the fact which Dr. Farrar points out, that Solomon is one of the least interesting of the men of the Bible; and also, on account of the sad degeneracy which marked the later years of his life, one of the most disappointing. The story of his life however, as the writer says, is instructive to point a moral if not to adorn a tale. And the Book of Ecclesiastes shows the deep impression which it made upon his own age, and which it is equally fitted to make upon every age. The main lesson to be gathered from it, viz., the fleeting and unsatisfactory character of worldly glory is very clearly brought out in this valuable and striking monograph of Dr. Farrar's.

*Social Arrows.* By LORD BRABAZON. (Longmans, Green, and Co.) This is a new and amended edition of a work which has already met with a considerable degree of public favour. Lord Brabazon has devoted himself to the study of some of the most pressing social problems of the present day, and in the pages of this book he gives us his own personal contribution towards their solution. The subjects discussed are, "Open Spaces," "Associations for the Benefit of Young Men, Women, and Children," "Over Population; its Evils and Remedies," "The Cause of the Overworked Shop Assistant," "Some Social Wants of London." To the examination and consideration of these important practical questions the writer brings a candid and unprejudiced mind, and a heart full of benevolent sympathy with his poorer and less fortunate fellow-countrymen, and an earnest desire to redress their wrongs, and to ameliorate their social condition. As the result, we have a book which cannot fail to do good. In the cheap form in which it has been issued, it is well fitted for extensive circulation.



